

BYZANTINE HERESY.
A REINTERPRETATION

NINA G. GARSOÏAN

Except for the notes, this article is substantially identical with a paper read at the Symposium on "Byzantine Society," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1969.

IN a recent article in *Travaux et mémoires* Jean Gouillard has recalled our attention to our vast ignorance on the subject of Byzantine heresies and appealed, before all else, for a rigorous review of the sources.¹ I agree wholeheartedly with his estimate that this is not the time for syntheses, and I should, therefore, like to limit myself to a few considerations and some questions of method and direction. In doing this, I shall concentrate on the so-called "middle" period following the great theological and christological disputes of the early Empire, and focus primarily on the Paulician heresy because its traditionally assigned central role as the link and transmitter of heterodoxy from East to West, to be found in all heretical *catenae* from the seventeenth century on,² may permit us to raise some questions of a more general nature concerning Byzantine sects.

Three main approaches have dominated twentieth-century studies of mid-Byzantine heresy: the social interpretation, which sees the sectarians primarily as a proletarian movement in revolt against the intolerable oppression of a feudal society; the ethno-regional thesis, associating heretics with Armenia, Bulgaria, or Phrygia; and the Manichaeic-Gnostic identification, which, through its insistence on the dualism of the heterodox doctrine, must ultimately deny its essential Christianity. Because of their persistent reappearance, it will be necessary to consider at some length the validity of these guiding assumptions.³

In a sense, the most recent, the proletarian thesis is the least substantial, as has often been shown. Historically it derives from an early view of the sectarians as simple folk living in idyllic peasant communities reminiscent of apostolic times and from Engels' interpretation of the German peasant movement of the sixteenth century as a revolt of the rural proletariat. Neither image can be sustained in the sources.

¹ J. Gouillard, "L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XII^e siècle," *Travaux et mémoires*, Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantines, I (Paris, 1965), (hereafter, Gouillard, "Hérésie"), 299–324.

² For a recent such *catena*, see S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge, 1947).

³ For a review of the literature on the social and Gnostic interpretations of Paulicianism, see N. Garsoian, *The Paulician Heresy* (The Hague, 1967) (hereafter, *Paulician Heresy*), 17–24. Among the more recent formulations of the social thesis on Paulicianism and Bogomilism are E. Lipshits, *Ocherki istorii vizantiiskogo obshchestva i kul'tury VIII-pervaia polovina IX veka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1961) (hereafter, *Ocherki*); S. Melik'-Başşyan, *Hayastan VII–IX davarum* (Erevan, 1968); D. Angelov, *Bogomil'stvo v Bolgarii* (Moscow, 1954); G. Seidler, *Sozialideen in Byzanz* (Berlin, 1960); and E. Werner, "Byzantinische Ideengeschichte—Versuch und Aufgabe," *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963), 111–26. A recognition of the persistent association of Montanism with Phrygia is to be found in Gouillard, "Hérésie," 310, despite the earlier misgivings of P. de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste* (Paris, 1913), 3 ff. The association of Paulicianism with Armenia can be found, *inter alia*, in N. Adontz, "Les fonds historiques de l'épopée byzantine Digenis Akritas," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 29 (1929/30), 198–227, and P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (Lisbon, n.d. = *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 [1961]), 13, 15–16. For the Balkan setting of Bogomilism and the literature on the subject, see D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge, 1948). On the most recent Gnostic ancestors of the Paulicians—the Marcionites—see J. Jarry, "Hérésies et factions à Constantinople du V^e au VII^e siècle," *Syria*, 37 (1960), 364–71, and M. Loos, "Le mouvement paulicien à Byzance, II," *Byzantinoslavica*, 25 (1964) (hereafter, "Mouvement II"), 56–63. All these interpretations are still maintained as hypotheses by Gouillard, "Hérésie," 323 f.

The accusation of ignorance in the mouth of ecclesiastical polemicists does not turn the heresiarchs into illiterates and consequently into proletarians. Sergios, the greatest Paulician leader of the ninth century, Kouleon, Kousinos, and Pholos, who gave so much trouble to Alexis I Comnenos according to his daughter Anna, and Basil the contemporary Bogomil leader were all learned men.⁴ While it is true that a majority of the heretics were to be found in the countryside, it may be well to remember that repeated legislation in the Theodosian and Justinianic *Codices*, subsequently renewed in the Macedonian *Basilica*, not only forbade heretical assemblies but specifically drove heretics from the capital and from all municipalities as well.⁵ The rural setting of the sects need consequently not derive exclusively from a peasant background or a love of the simple life, but from considerations of safety and necessity. Moreover, we can observe an interesting tendency of the sectarians to creep back to urban surroundings at the first opportunity. The early Paulician communities of the seventh century edged close to the great *kastron* and episcopal city of Koloneia; in the eighth century, the heresiarch Joseph chose to live in a suburb of Antioch of Pisidia; by the ninth century, if not earlier, Paulician churches were established in cities such as Mopsuestia in Cilicia; and no sooner were they given a freedom of operation by Muslim protection than the heretics congregated in centers such as Amara, Argaus, or their capital Tephrike, as they were to do later in the Balkans, at Philippopolis and elsewhere.⁶ When persecution scattered the communities, the sectarians fled for refuge, but some at least were city-folk, and a number of them lived in the capital, as we shall subsequently see. Similarly, the presence of Bogomils in Constantinople in the eleventh and twelfth centuries precludes our restricting them to Slavic peasants, and despite the alleged predilection of the Montanists for the backwoods of Phrygia we should not forget that a special edict of Justinian was required in 530 to drive their hierarchy from Constantinople.⁷

The existence of such a hierarchy, incidentally, tends to contradict the image of a primitive, egalitarian, and democratic community. Despite con-

⁴ On Sergios, see Peter of Sicily, *Historia utilis et refutatio atque eversio haereseos Manichaeorum qui et Pauliciani dicuntur Bulgariae archiepiscopo nuncupata* (hereafter, Petrus Siculus), xxxiii, PG, 104, cols. 1289 A; also M. Loos, "Le mouvement paulicien à Byzance, I," *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963) (hereafter, "Mouvement I"), 269. On the Comnenian heretics, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, ed. and trans. B. Leib (Paris, 1937-1945), XIV.viii-ix; XV.viii-x. See also Psellos, *De daemonum energia seu operatione*, x, PG, 122, col. 841, and C. Puech and A. Vaillant trans. and comm., *Le traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le prêtre* (Paris, 1945) (hereafter, Cosmas, *Traité*, for the text, and Puech or Vaillant, *Traité*, for the commentaries), 165f.

⁵ *Cod. Th.*, XVI.v.6; 7(3); 8, cf. 9; 12; 14; 20; 30-34; 57, cf. 62-65. *Nov. Val.*, XVIII.1.1, etc. *CJ*, I.v.5; 8; 14; 20; vi.6. *Nov.*, XLII, etc. *Basil.* I.1.2-3; 6; 25; 27; 29-30; 33, etc.

⁶ Petrus Siculus, xxiv, PG, 104, col. 1280 A; xxxi, col. 1285 D; xxxviii, col. 1297 B; xli-xlii, col. 1301 BC. Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI.iv.2-3; xiv.2-3; XIV.viii.7, 9, ix.4; XV.ix. Cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 114, note 5, 119, note 23, 128, and Loos, "Mouvement I," 285. The Novatians showed the same pattern of flight to the suburbs and return after the crisis in an earlier period, see R. Janin, "Les Novatians orientaux," *Echos d'Orient*, 28 (1929), 385-97, and cf. next note for the Montanists. The Iconodules likewise took refuge in the countryside during the persecution of Leo III: Stephanus Diaconus, *Vita S. Stephani Iunioris*, PG, 100, cols. 1070-1185.

⁷ *CJ*, I.v.20; H. Grégoire, "Du nouveau sur la hiérarchie de la secte montaniste d'après une inscription grecque trouvée près de Philadelphie en Lydie," *Byzantion*, 2 (1925) (hereafter, "Hiérarchie"), 333-35.

siderable work, the precise structure of the Paulician sect cannot yet be reconstituted, but it already seems evident that its rejection of the Orthodox ecclesiastical establishment did not mean a rejection of spiritual leadership as such. With one exception, the Paulicians obeyed a single heresiarch, and in the one hiatus before the tenth century we hear of a ruling group called *synekdemoi*, and of *notarioi* inferior to them.⁸ In view of our knowledge that the Montanists had developed a complete ecclesiastical hierarchy ranging down from a patriarch, through companions (*κοινωνοί* or *socii*), bishops, priests, and deacons, and that the Montanists and Paulicians were in contact early in the ninth century, it may be warranted to speculate whether the *synekdemoi* or "fellow-travellers" of the Paulician leader should not be related to the "companions" of the Montanist patriarch, while the *notarioi* would then represent the lower ranks of the clergy, perhaps deacons rather than priests. Such an elaboration of the Paulician hierarchy is supported by the references among later Armenian Paulicians to an arch-ruler or president, rulers, bishops, and priests.⁹ Among the Bogomils, likewise, a rudimentary hierarchy seems provided by Basil the heresiarch and his "twelve apostles," and it was to become more extensive in the later medieval period.¹⁰

Documentary evidence shows that Paulicianism was present in all classes of society. There were slaves at Tephrike and shepherds in the countryside, but so were there soldiers, not only in the thematic armies, but in the better paid and more prominent *tagmata*, to which I shall also return.¹¹ All that may be deduced from the passages on the composition of the Iconoclastic party in the *Apologeticus* of the Patriarch Nikephoros, adduced to demonstrate the lower-class background of heresy, is that the recruits had been reduced to destitution after their dismissal, since as *tagmata* they depended on the state for their pay and maintenance. The passage does not warrant the assumption that the soldiers had been poor from the start.¹² A provision against Manichaeans in the

⁸ Petrus Siculus, xli, PG, 104, col. 1301 C. Cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 120, note 30, and Loos, "Mouvement I," 285, note 141, for critiques of recent attempts to reconstruct the organization of the Byzantine Paulician community. Personal rivalries over the actual leadership of the sect do not invalidate its theoretical unity.

⁹ See Grégoire, "Hiérarchie," 331–35, for the Montanist hierarchy, and, for that of the Armenian Paulicians, *The Key of Truth: A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia*, ed. and trans. F. C. Conybe (Oxford, 1898) (hereafter, *Key of Truth*), 38–45 (text) = 101–108 (trans.). On the authenticity of the *Key of Truth* as a Paulician document, see *Paulician Heresy*, 108–11, 151–66.

¹⁰ Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, xv.viii.3: Βασίλειος γάρ τις μοναχὸς . . . δώδεκα μὲν ἔχων μαθητάς, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζε, συνεφελκόμενος δὲ καὶ μαθητρίας τινας, γυναῖκα κακοήθη καὶ παμπόνηρα On the organization of later Bogomilism, see Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee*, 107f., and Puech, *Traité*, 237–43; also Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia dogmatica*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1288 C, for the Messalians. It is likewise tempting to link the Montanist *κοινωνοί* and the Paulician συνέδημοι with the *gosti* or "apostles" of Bosnian Bogomilism, cf. O. D. Mandić, *Bogomilska Crkva Bosanskih Krstjana* (Chicago, 1962), 210–20.

¹¹ Petrus Siculus, xxx, PG, 104, col. 1285 AB; by the same author, *Sermo secundus*, PG, 104, col. 1333 D; cf. Loos, "Mouvement I," 284–86, who admits that the sources contain no information concerning Paulician social ideas. For the army, see *infra*, notes 12, 19, 61.

¹² Nikephoros Patriarch, *Apologeticus pro inculpabili, pura et immaculata nostra christianorum fide* . . . , PG, 100, col. 556 B–D, cf. *idem*, *Refutatio et eversio* . . . (hereafter, *Antirrheticus*), iii, *ibid.*, cols. 492 C, 493 A; also Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 185–86, and P. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* (Oxford, 1958) (hereafter, *Nicephorus*), 111–25, 221. The Emperor Nikephoros I unquestionably conscripted the poor into his army, cf. Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 119–22. However, both

Epanagoge suggests the presence of Paulicians within the city administration.¹³ Both in Asia Minor and the Balkans, Paulicians are spoken of as possessing considerable property.¹⁴ Most importantly, Paulicians were to be found in the upper classes of society: Symeon, the second leader of Byzantine Paulicianism, was an imperial official, and in the mid-ninth century their adherent Lizix was part of the central bureaucracy with the probable rank of *proto a secretis*.¹⁵ Of the last leaders of this period, Karbeas was a staff officer of the commander in chief of the army, Theodotos Melissenos *strategos* of Anatolikon, while his nephew and successor Chrysocheir at the beginning of his career as *spatharios* is addressed as a personal friend in the letters of the Patriarch Photios.¹⁶ Even in the late and distorted version of the *Digenis Akrites*, Karbeas and Chrysocheir, uncle and father respectively of Digenis' own father the emir, are remembered as aristocratic and not as popular leaders.¹⁷ Similarly, the late Armenian sources speak of prominent Paulicians: ladies of leading families and mistresses of villages, Bishop Jacob of Hark', and Prince Vrvver of Širi.¹⁸

Nor were the heretics automatically enemies of the state. They rejected the authority of the Orthodox clergy, but they served regularly in the imperial armies from the eighth to the eleventh century at least, and in the Muslim armies as well.¹⁹ The heresiarch Genesios was willing to come to Constantinople to discuss his religious beliefs with the emperor and the patriarch, as was to be done, albeit with less success, by his descendants and by Basil the Bogomil.²⁰

the *tagmata* and the *themata* normally belonged to relatively prosperous strata of the population (see H. Glykatzis-Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX–XI siècles," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 84 [1960] [hereafter, "Recherches"], 8–10, 25 ff.), and the *tagmata* depended on the state for their pay, equipment, and maintenance. The acknowledgement of this fact in the *Apologeticus*, col. 556 C: ... οἱ ἐπειδὴ τῶν βασιλικῶν σιτηρεσίων στερούμενοι, ἐξ ὧν αὐτοῖς μετὰ τῆς τῶν ὀπλῶν παρασκευῆς καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἐπορίζετο, εἰς ἄκρον πενίας καὶ ἀπορίας τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἵκοντο ... and the mention of the old age of at least some of the soldiers, *ibid.*, col. 556 B: ... μέρος οὐκ εὐαρίθμητον τῶν ἐν στρατιωτικοῖς τάγμασι τελούντων ποτέ, ὧν οἱ μὲν ἄτε παρηβηκότες τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἀφῆλικες ... both suggest that the passage is referring on the whole to Constantine V's regularly enrolled troops rather than to Nikephoros I's extraordinary levies.

¹³ *Epanagoge*, XL.30, in *Jus Graecoromanum*, eds. J. and P. Zepos (Athens, 1931) (hereafter, *Jus*), II, 361 f.; *Procheiros Nomos*, xxxix.29, *ibid.*, 219. Cf. Loos, "Mouvement I," 285–86, and M. Siuziumov, "Remeslo i trgovlia v Konstantinopole v nachale X veka," *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, N.S., 4 (1951), 41.

¹⁴ Loos, "Mouvement I," 285 f. Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI. II. 3–4; IV. 2, etc.

¹⁵ Petrus Siculus, xxv–xxvii, PG, 104, cols. 1280 B–1281 D (... ἀποστέλλει βασιλικὸν τινα, Συμεῶνα καλούμενον ...); Niketas Choniates, *Ex libro incerto thesauri orthodoxae fidei*, PG, 140, cols. 281–84; cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 34 and note 40, 179 f., and J. Gouillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclisme," *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 371–87.

¹⁶ See *Paulician Heresy*, 30 f., 39, 125–29, for the relevant texts.

¹⁷ J. Mavrogordato ed. and trans., *Digenes Akrites* (Oxford, 1956), vss. 283–86; see *infra*, note 28, for the text.

¹⁸ Aristakēs Lastivertçi, *Patmut'iwn Aristakisi Lastivertçwoy*, ed. K. N. Yuzbašyan (Erevan, 1963), xxii–xxiii, 119–33.

¹⁹ For the presence of Paulicians in the army of Constantine V, see *supra*, note 12, and *infra*, notes 56, 58. For their presence in the imperial armies in Italy and among the Muslim contingents during the Crusades, see *Paulician Heresy*, 13–16, especially notes 3, 4, 6. On Paulician detachments in the Balkans, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI. II, IV; XIV. VIII–IX, etc. A special *tagma* of "Manichaeans" seems to have existed until its dissolution by Alexis I; cf. Glykatzis-Ahrweiler, "Recherches," 33, for the texts.

²⁰ Petrus Siculus, xxix, PG, 104, col. 1284 B–D; Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, XIV. IX. 3, 5; XV. VIII. 3–6; IX; x. 1–4.

Fleeing from persecution in the Empire, the Paulicians, far from cowering in the mountains, sought the direct help of the most powerful contemporary emir of the eastern frontier, Omar ibn Abdallah ibn Marwan al-Aqta' of Melitene.²¹

In fact, much of the thesis of the proletarian character of Paulicianism derives from the principle of guilt by association: The Paulicians were said to be Manichaeans and the dualist rejection of matter as evil was but an expression of the heretics' hatred of worldly goods and power and of those who possessed them.²² Leaving aside for the moment the question of Manichaean identification, such an argument leads necessarily to the surprising conclusion that religious ascetics are recruited exclusively from the lower classes. Again, the Paulicians were associated with the Bogomils, whose movement sprang from the oppression of the Balkan peasantry in the tenth century. But here too the exclusive identification of Bogomilism as a social rather than a religious movement has been seriously queried, and Anna Comnena specifically says that the heresy in her time had penetrated into the highest classes of Constantinopolitan society.²³ Finally, the Paulicians served in the armies of Thomas the Slav, whose rebellion was a social revolt. Once more, not only is the presence of Paulicians in Thomas' army not absolutely certain, since the listing in which they are included may rest on literary tradition rather than historical evidence and is unsupported by any source specifically dealing with the Paulicians, but Thomas' followers were heterogeneous in the extreme, he had aristocratic supporters, and Paul Lemerle has recently reminded us, that "nous ne savons absolument rien sur le programme social de Thomas, ou de mesures quelconques qu'il aurait prises dans ce domaine."²⁴

If the sectarians should not be segregated socially, neither should they be isolated on the basis of national or regional origin.²⁵ There is, to be sure, little doubt that Paulicianism originally developed in Armenia, as the non-Greek form of its name and its early history indicate; or that it survived in this area long after its historical role in Byzantium.²⁶ A number of its leaders even on imperial territory were either specifically identified in the sources as Armenians

²¹ Petrus Siculus, xli, PG, 104, col. 1301. See *Paulician Heresy*, 119f., 125–28, and Loos, "Mouvement I," 278–83, for the relevant texts.

²² Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 165f.

²³ See Obolensky, *The Bogomils*, 137 and note 4, with his reservations, and Angelov, *Bogomil'stvo v Bolgarii*, although he too has some misgivings. Cf. Puech, *Traité*, 165f., citing both Psellos and Anna Comnena.

²⁴ P. Lemerle, "Thomas le Slave," *Travaux et mémoires*, I (Paris, 1965), 296, with whom Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 213–28, especially, 214, 227, is forced to agree and to admit the presence of aristocrats among Thomas' supporters, despite her general thesis that the revolt had social overtones, *ibid.*, 151, 154, 209, 294. On the composition of Thomas' army, see Genesius, *Basileia*, CSHB (Bonn, 1834), 33, and, for the possible literary origin of the list, A. A. Vasil'ev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, I: *La dynastie d'Amorium*, trans. H. Grégoire, M. Canard, *et al.* (Brussels, 1935), 31, note 2; and Loos, "Mouvement I," 279, note 100, citing Barišič. It is interesting to note that none of the polemical sources on the Paulicians has any mention of Thomas' revolt.

²⁵ The adequacy of the socio-nationalistic interpretation was already queried for the earlier period by A. H. M. Jones, "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?" *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., 10.2 (1959), 280–98.

²⁶ *Paulician Heresy*, especially chapter V, where I, too, may have underestimated the significance of the secondary Neo-Paulician tradition in Byzantium with which this paper is concerned.

or bore unmistakably Armenian names, as did Baanes (Vahan), the rival of the great Sergios.²⁷ Similarly, much of Bogomilism has been and should be associated with a Slavic milieu. Nevertheless, these identifications are not exclusive and may be misleading through the suggestion that we are dealing with anything like a nationalist movement.

The early Paulician heresiarch Symeon was not a local Armenian but an imperial envoy from Constantinople. Sergios was a Greek, as were the army officers Karbeas and Chrysocheir whom even the *Digenis Akrites* mistakenly turns into Arabs but never into Armenians.²⁸ Chrysocheir's supporter Diakonitzes and the traitor Pulades were unquestionably Greeks, and none of the later Paulician leaders in the Balkans has an Armenian name.²⁹ Indeed, Anna Comnena explicitly distinguishes between the Armenians and the Paulicians in the region of Philippopolis.³⁰ Far from keeping rigorously to themselves, the Paulicians associated with other heretics as well as with Jews, and intermarried with the Petchenegs.³¹ The pastoral names—Silvanos, Titos, Timotheos, Epaphroditos, or Tychikos—assumed by their leaders, whatever their own background, had no Armenian associations. As avowed disciples of the Apostle to the Gentiles, they were particularly ill-placed to advocate racial exclusiveness in religion. Far from sheltering or supporting them, the Armenian Church and officialdom anathematized and pursued them with the same unrelenting zeal as had the imperial power or the Bulgarian authorities dealing with Bogomils.³² In their makeup, outlook, and actions the Paulicians were neither more nor less heterogeneous than the normal composition of Byzantine society in this period. The Slavic coloration of the Bogomils is perhaps deeper, though not their allegiance to their national state, but the *Synodikon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy* states that they were spread through all the cities, towns, and provinces of the Empire.³³ It seems incredible that the Byzantine aris-

²⁷ Petrus Siculus, xxxi, PG, 104, col. 1288 A. *Paulician Heresy*, 119, 145, 183, note 158.

²⁸ Sergios came from the neighborhood of Tabia in the theme of Armeniakon and his father Druinos has a clearly non-Armenian name, Petrus Siculus, xxxii, PG, 104, col. 1288 B. *Digenes Akrites*, vss. 283–88: ... ὁ ἀμρῶς ἀντέφη, / Ὑρσοβέργου υἱὸς εἰμι ... / Ἀμβρων ὑπῆρχε μου παπποῦς, θεῖος μὲν ὁ Καρόης / ... παρὰ μητρὸς ἐδόθην δὲ εἰς συγγενεῖς Ἀράβους, / οἵτινές με ἀνέθρεψαν εἰς τὸ εὖ μετὰ πρόθου (εἰς Μωαμέτ τὴν πίστιν, see p. 19, vs. 288, note). Cf. Loos, "Mouvement I," 282f. The attempt made by H. Bart'ikyan, *Istochniki dlia izuchenii istorii pavlikianskogo dvizheniia* (Erevan, 1963) (hereafter, *Istochniki*), 166, note 43, to turn Karbeas into an Armenian seems quite unconvincing and farfetched.

²⁹ Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, CSHB (Bonn, 1838), 274f., 313; Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium*, CSHB (Bonn, 1838–39), II, 211f., 236; Genesius, *Basileia*, 125; Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, V.viii.2 (Xanthas and Kouleon), VI.vi.2 (Traulos), XIV.ix.3 (Kouleon, Kousinos, Pholos).

³⁰ Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, XIV.viii.7: Πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ Φιλιππούπολις πλὴν ὀλίγων ὄντες Μανιχαῖοι ... Συνεισέβαλε δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕτερος ποταμὸς ὁ τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἄλμυρός ... ; cf. viii.3.

³¹ Petrus Siculus, xxxi, PG, 104, col. 1288 A, identifies Baanes as the bastard of an Armenian woman and one of Joseph's Jewish disciples, and the accusation of Judaizing is often brought against the Paulicians, probably on doctrinal grounds, as is the case with the Athinganoi, with whom they were often associated. See *Paulician Heresy*, 211, 213, and J. Starr, "An Eastern Christian Sect: the Athinganoi," *Harvard Theological Review*, 29 (1936) (hereafter, "Athinganoi"), 93–106. On the Petcheneg marriages, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI.iv.3.

³² See *Paulician Heresy*, 89, 94f., 98, 132f., 138f., 144f., 149f., 232, for the Paulician persecution in Armenia, and Cosmas, *Traité*, xix, p. 86, as well as Annexe, "Le Synodique de l'empereur Boril," for some of the Bulgarian texts. Cf. Angelov, *Bogomil'stvo v Bolgarii*, chap. V, 92–96, for the relations of the Bogomils with the Bulgarian state.

³³ J. Gouillard ed. "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie," *Travaux et mémoires*, Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantines, II (Paris, 1967) (hereafter, *Synodikon* for the text, and Gouillard,

tocracy of the late eleventh century, allegedly permeated by the heresy, was of Slavic origin, or that Anna Comnena, who invariably takes such pleasure in expatiating on the barbarian loutishness of all foreigners, including the great philosopher John Italos, should have failed to do so in the case of Basil the Bogomil, had this been warranted or possible.³⁴

Certain regions have also been singled out as breeding grounds of heresy, Phrygia and the northeastern theme of Armeniakon in particular. But Phrygia has been blamed for so many heresies—Novatians, Sabellians, Montanists, Athinganoi, the Paulicians themselves—that the suspicion arises that it was as much a convenient refuge, not too distant from the capital, in time of trouble, as a heretical district by nature. Bogomils scattered not only over the whole of the Balkans and into the capital, but into the Thrakesian and Kibyrrreot themes of Asia Minor, if we are to believe Euthymios of the Peribleptos.³⁵ Paulicians apparently began their career in southern Armenia, moved into the northwestern district of Mananali, and only then seeped into the adjacent imperial theme of Armeniakon. While some may have clung to the district, others soon abandoned it. But instead of heading back to Armenia after the earlier imperial persecutions, the Paulician leaders first turned westward toward the capital. By the end of the eighth century their center was in the Anatolic rather than the Armeniac theme, and their communities were so scattered that Sergios could be blamed for never having met his predecessor in the leadership of the sect.³⁶ In the ninth century, Michael I's edict of persecution localized the Paulicians and Athinganoi in Phrygia and Lykaonia without any mention of Armeniakon or other districts, and in their flight eastward the heretics sought the southern cities of Melitene and Mopsuestia rather than

"Synodikon" for the commentary), p. 65: ... κατὰ γὰρ τὰς τοιαύτας προρήσεις, ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις καιροῖς γενομένων ἡμῶν, ἡ παμμιγῆς καὶ πολυώνυμος τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν εἶτ' οὖν Βογομίλων αἵρεσις ἐν πάσῃ πόλει καὶ χώρῃ, καὶ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπιπολάζει τὰ νῦν, ... = Euthymius Zigabenus, *Confutatio et eversio ... Massaliorum sectae* ... (hereafter, *Confutatio*), PG, 131, col. 41 B. Cf. Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, cols. 1289 D–1321 A; Euthymius Peribleptos, *Epistula invectiva contra Phundagiagitas sive Bogomilos haereticos*, in G. Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten* (Leipzig, 1908) (hereafter, *Ep. inv.*), 27, 67–69; and *infra*, notes 34–38.

³⁴ Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, XV.viii; cf. V.iii. 3, 6–8, on Italos, or X.vii, viii. 1, 8; x, 6, on the Crusaders. Basil's portrait, while admittedly unflattering, carries no suggestion of foreign birth or of the "barbarousness" automatically associated with it.

³⁵ W. Frend, "The Winning of the Countryside," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 18.1 (1967), Gouillard, "Hérésie," 310, 315—for Montanists, Sabbatians, and Athinganoi; Janin, "Les Novatiens orientaux," 386, 397—for Novatians and Montanists. The edict of Michael I (for which see *infra*, note 37) locates both Athinganoi and Paulicians in Phrygia, etc. Throughout, Phrygia reappears systematically and monotonously as the *locus classicus* for heresy in general, but even in the case of the Montanists, whose association with the region seems to have been particularly close, it may be wise to remember the opening warning of de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste*, 3: "Je crois que l'on a beaucoup exagéré l'importance du rapport qui aurait uni le Montanisme à la Phrygie, son pays d'origine." For the spread of the Bogomils and of heretics in general, see *supra*, note 33; Euthymius Peribleptos, *Ep. inv.*, 62–64, 67; Puech, *Traité*, 166–68, and *infra*, note 38.

³⁶ For the various Paulician moves, see *Paulician Heresy*, 112–50, 220 ff., and Loos, "Mouvement I." It is interesting to observe that both the flight of Paul the Armenian from Kibossa near Koloneia to Episparris in Phanaroia (Petrus Siculus, xxviii, PG, 104, col. 1284 A), and that of Joseph from Episparris to Antioch of Pisidia (Petrus Siculus, xxxi, PG, 104, col. 1285 CD), carried them westward rather than eastward toward Armenia. For the accusation against Sergios, see Petrus Siculus, xl, PG, 104, col. 1300 C: ... σὺ νεωστὶ κατεφάνης, καὶ οὐδένα τῶν διδασκάλων ἡμῶν ἐώρακας ἢ συμπαρέμεινας ...

the northern districts of Armeniakon.³⁷ By its later stages, Paulicianism was spread from Syria, across Armenia and Asia Minor, possibly to Crete, eventually to Italy, and unquestionably over the Balkans, to which they referred as home.³⁸ In no sense could they any longer be identified exclusively with north-western Armenia or contiguous Armeniakon, and spontaneously heretical lands seem closer to mythology than to history.

The most persistent characterization which has been attached to the Paulicians is that of Manichaeism, through which they have been classified as dualists in theology and docetists or phantasiasts, denying the Incarnation, in Christology. This is the characterization which has qualified them as the main link in the transmission of dualism from the Persian Manichaeans to the Albigensians of southern France.³⁹

The key source on which rests the explicit identification of Paulicianism with classic Manichaeism is the *History of the Manichaeans who are also called Paulicians* by a certain Peter of Sicily, who claims to have been the ambassador of Basil I to the Paulician capital of Tephrike.⁴⁰ Peter has been fortunate in his defenders in this century, and his thinking has dominated our own; he is the touchstone for other information, and even Armenian scholars, respectful of his authority, reject all Armenian references to the Paulicians contradictory to Peter as interpolations into the texts.⁴¹ Yet, Peter does not know the geography of the district which he had allegedly visited, but Peter is an honorable man. Peter does not know the name of the archbishop of Bulgaria to whom he dedicated his work at a time when Bulgaria probably had no archbishop, but Peter is an honorable man. Peter, the official imperial ambassador,

³⁷ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, C. de Boor, ed. (Leipzig, 1888), I, 488, 495 f.: ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς κατὰ Μανιχαίων, τῶν νῦν Παυλικιάνων, καὶ Ἀσιγγάνων τῶν ἐν Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Λυκαονίᾳ, κεφαλικὴν τιμωρίαν ἀποφηνάμενος ταῖς Νικηφόρου, τῶν ἀγιωτάτου πατριάρχου, καὶ ἄλλων εὐσεβῶν εἰσηγήσεσιν ἀνετράπη . . . = Cedrenus, *Compendium*, II, 39; cf. V. Grumel ed., *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I: *Les actes des patriarches*, Fasc. II (Istanbul, 1936) (hereafter, *Regestes*), no. 383, p. 26 f. For the establishment of Paulicians in the regions of Melitene and Mopsuestia, see Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 161–63, and *supra*, note 21.

³⁸ See *supra*, notes 19, 36, 37; Gouillard, "Hérésie," 315 f.; Loos, "Mouvement I," 266, and "Mouvement II," 66 f. On the predilection of the Paulicians for the Balkans in the Comnenian period, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI. II. 4. The case for Crete is less clear: Gouillard ("Synodikon," 186 f., and "Hérésie," 314, citing B. Laourdas, 'Ο ἐκ Λάμπης Γερόντιος, in *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 6 [1952], 161 f.), rejects the possibility that Gerontios of Lampe was an Iconoclast, despite his anathematization in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, although Laourdas himself is less categorical on the subject. Gerontios' claim to be a Messiah, if really made (*Synodikon*, p. 57, line 181: . . . ἡλειμμένον ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλέσαντι . . . [cf. app. crit. *ad loc.*, and Gouillard, "Hérésie," 314, for the textual problem]), would be quite consonant with the traditional claim of Paulician heresiarchs that they were Christs or the Paraclete, and by way of Paulicianism his inclusion among the Iconoclasts anathematized in the *Synodikon* would thus be justified. See *infra*, for the Paulician claims and their Iconoclasm, and *Paulician Heresy*, 139–45, for the Paulician survival in Armenia.

³⁹ This interpretation can still be found in most current literature, e.g., *The Cambridge Medieval History*, IV, pt. 2 (Cambridge, 1967), 190–93.

⁴⁰ Petrus Siculus, XL, PG, 104, col. 1300 B: Ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς οἶσθω ἑτέραν αἵρεσιν εἶναι ἣν ἐδίδαξεν Σέργιος, καὶ ἑτέραν τοῦ Μάνεντος· μία γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἡ αὐτή . . .; cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 168 f., and *infra*, notes 42, 44.

⁴¹ For a discussion of the authenticity of Peter of Sicily's *History*, see *Paulician Heresy*, chap. I, especially 55–68. For the most recent objections to references to the Paulicians in Armenian sources antedating Peter's information, see Bart'ikyan, *Istochniki*, introduction, and the review of his work by M. Loos, in *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963), 135 ff., as well as my critique of Bart'ikyan's objections, *Paulician Heresy*, 87–90, and note 28.

is totally ignorant of his master's business and of the shockingly insolent message he was presumably bringing back to Basil I, but Peter is an honorable man.⁴² To show the length to which scholars have gone to protect Peter's reputation, one example will suffice: Peter tells us that the first Paulician heresiarch, Constantine, came from the neighborhood of the city of Samosata of Armenia, from the village of Mananali. Noting that Samosata is not in Armenia, Henri Grégoire amended the passage to read "Arsamosata," though the parallel *History* attributed to the Patriarch Photios regrettably specifies that "Samosata is a Syrian city." Observing in his turn that the city of Arsamosata is hardly in the vicinity of Mananali, which is a province and not a village, lying more than one hundred kilometers away across the Euphrates and a major mountain range, M. Loos has now suggested that we search for an otherwise unknown village named Mananali near Arsamosata.⁴³ Surely, enough ingenuity has already been expended to bend the facts to the text. The time has come to admit that Peter's *History* with its discrepancies, contradictions, and variations in style is a later composite work containing genuine and valuable sources on seventh-to-ninth-century Byzantine Paulicianism, but linking them with documents from a distant and totally irrelevant, if authentic, Manichaean past, and reworking the whole to support the thesis of the Manichaean origin of Paulicianism.⁴⁴

Following Peter's lead, most scholars have indulged in antiquarian expeditions of their own to propose various early dualist sects—Manichaeans, Marcionites, Messalians—as the ancestors of Paulicianism.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, as I have tried to show elsewhere, early Paulician doctrine shows no signs of dualism or docetism. It emerges rather as a simple-minded form of Judaic Christianity, adoptionist in Christology to preserve at all cost the unity of the Godhead and making the true believer a sharer in Jesus' adoption as Son of God; strictly obedient to the injunction against the making of graven images and consequently violently iconoclastic; rejecting infant baptism and the Orthodox sacraments together with the authority of the official clergy; and basing its doctrine exclusively on the Scriptures.⁴⁶ As late as 719, the Armenian kat'olikos, John of Ojun, condemned them primarily as iconoclasts, differentiating them from the docetists or phantasiasts to whom he devoted a separate treatise.⁴⁷

⁴² *Paulician Heresy*, 70–73, 75.

⁴³ Petrus Siculus, xxiii, PG, 104, col. 1276 C: ... γέγονέ τις Ἀρμένιος ὀνόματι Κωνσταντῖνος ἐν τῷ Σαμωσάτῳ τῆς Ἀρμενίας, ἐν κώμῃ Μανανάλει λεγομένη Ps.-Photius, *Narratio de Manichaeis recens repullulantibus*, PG, 102, col. 16 D: Σαμώσατα πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Συρίας ..., cf. H. Grégoire, "Précisions géographiques et chronologiques sur les Pauliciens," *Académie Royale de Belgique. Bulletin, Classe des lettres*, 5th Ser., 22 (1936), 293f., Loos, "Mouvement I," 259f., and the preceding note. On the parallel between the histories of Peter of Sicily and the Pseudo-Photius, see *Paulician Heresy*, 38–40, 73–79, particularly 73, note 173.

⁴⁴ See *supra*, note 42. Loos, "Mouvement I," 258, 261f., independently came to the conclusion that Peter of Sicily's compilation incorporated an earlier, truly Paulician, tradition akin to the early Christian scriptures and hagiography—my Source A.

⁴⁵ See *supra*, notes 3, 39.

⁴⁶ *Paulician Heresy*, 150–67, 174, 210–12, etc.; cf. Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, col. 1292 BC.

⁴⁷ John of Ojun [Otzniensis], *Contra Paulicianos, Contra Phantasiasticos*, in *Opera* (Venice, 1834); cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 132f., 138f.

The first signs of dualism and docetism in the Paulician faith cannot be attested before the early ninth century, coinciding probably with the rule of Sergios the heresiarch, and heralding a serious doctrinal transformation.⁴⁸

Hence, even if we should admit the dogmatic similarity of Paulicianism to the various dualist sects which have been selected as its ancestors, a similarity which can be, and often has been, challenged on multiple grounds, we are still left with an irreducible historical problem. Whatever may have been the situation in fourth-century Armenia, no evidence can be adduced for contact between Paulicianism and any such sect in the ninth century, when its new dualist traits manifest themselves. On the contrary, the company known to have been kept by the Paulicians at this point is precisely the conservative one we should expect from their early career: the Montanists, with their obsolete allegiance to a prophetic tradition and consequent denial of the authority of the Orthodox hierarchy, the semi-Judaizing Athinganoi, who kept the Jewish sabbath while rejecting both circumcision and baptism.⁴⁹ Still more seriously, the survival of dualist sects from early Christian times to this period rests exclusively on conjecture. We have no trace of the Manichaeans in Asia Minor after Justinian's destructive persecution, and it is surely significant that Peter of Sicily, who can quote the Isaurian *Ekloga* where it suits his purpose, has to reach back to fourth-century sources such as Epiphanius and the *Acta Archelai* for his description of Manichaeism.⁵⁰ A hypothetical, unrecorded move of

⁴⁸ *Paulician Heresy*, 182–85.

⁴⁹ Petrus Siculus, xxxix, PG, 104, cols. 1297 CD, 1300 A. While the tone of Sergios' letter to Leo the Montanist and the accusation of separation from "the body of Christ" indicate a breach between the two sects in this period, such a schism must presuppose a previous association, despite the misgivings of Loos, "Mouvement II," 63, and Gouillard, "Hérésie," 309, cf. 311f.; this might also be the implication in Peter of Sicily's reference to the Isaurian *Ekloga* (see next note). The coupling of Paulicians and Athinganoi in the law of Michael I is absolutely clear (see *supra*, note 37), and it is also found in the treatise of Demetrius of Cyzicus cited in G. Ficker, *Die Erlasse des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel Alexios Studites* (Kiel, 1911), 22, note 1. On the conservative or Judaizing traits of the Montanists and Athinganoi: de Labriolle, *La crise montaniste*; J. Scharf, "The Jews, the Montanists and the Emperor Leo III," *BZ*, 59 (1966), 37–46; and Starr, "Athinganoi." The help given to the latter by St. Athanasia of Aegina seems to preclude the possibility of serious Manichaean heterodoxy on their part; cf. L. Bréhier, "Les populations rurales au IX^e siècle d'après l'hagiographie byzantine," *Byzantion*, 1 (1924), 186f., and Starr, "Athinganoi," 97. See *Paulician Heresy*, 186–93, 205, for the dissimilarity of Paulicianism and Manichaeism; 24 note 25, for Harnack's critique of the Marcionite thesis; and 207–210, for the rejection of the Messalian association.

⁵⁰ Petrus Siculus, xxiii, PG, 104, col. 1277 B: ... θειότατοι καὶ ὁρθόδοξοι ἡμῶν ... βασιλεῖς ... θεοπίλῳσι καὶ τοῦτο, Μανιχαίους καὶ Μοντανούς ξίφει τιμωρεῖσθαι = *Ekloga priv.*, xvii.52, in *Jus*, II, 61 = *Ekloga priv. aucta*, xvii.52, in *Jus*, VI, p. 46: Οἱ Μανιχαῖοι καὶ οἱ Μοντανοὶ ξίφει τιμωρεῖσθωσαν, going back to *CJ*, I.v.11f., 16, cf. 18, 21, which link the Montanists and the Manichaeans. Peter of Sicily identifies the Manichaeans condemned in the *Ekloga* with the Paulicians, as was the custom of later Greek polemicists. However, in the light of the constant favor shown by the Isaurian emperors to the Paulicians, it is far more likely that the *Ekloga* is merely repeating the provisions of the Justinianic Code—subsequently repeated both in the *Procheiros Nomos*, xxxix.28, in *Jus*, II, 219, and the *Basilica*, I.1.30, 32—which had been intended for authentic Manichaeans. The persecution of Montanists in the eighth century is attested by the order of forcible baptism which Leo III directed against them; cf. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 401. For the anachronism of Peter of Sicily's data, see *Paulician Heresy*, 60f., and, for the disappearance of Manichaeism in Asia Minor after Justinian's savage repression, E. de Stoop, *Essai sur la diffusion du Manichéisme dans l'empire romain* (Ghent, 1909), 43, 81–86; cf. Puech, *Traité*, 304f. Loos, "Mouvement II," 62, following Harnack, supposes that "les restes de la puissante église marcionite d'autrefois végétèrent encore longtemps dans les villages ..." but both Jarry, "Hérésies et factions ..." 368, and Gouillard, "Hérésie," 304–306, question the identification of the sixth-century Markianites with the earlier Marcionites.

the fourth-century Messalians from the East to Thrace, under putative Armenian auspices, has to be postulated so that they might merge with Paulicianism in the tenth century to produce Bogomilism and so that Psellos might find their presumed descendants in the district more than a century later.⁵¹ In short, the Manichaean or Gnostic interpretation of Paulicianism forces us to conjure up phantom sects appearing and disappearing like the Cheshire cat, some of them having to be kept up our sleeve for centuries so that they might be produced at the opportune moment to play their appointed role.

So far, my activity has been primarily destructive, and it may be objected that the Paulicians had occasionally been called Manichaeans before the ninth century. As I have attempted to show elsewhere, the term "Manichaean" in the eighth century often took on the sense of "Iconoclast" in the mouth of such orthodox writers as Saint John of Damascus, and was then transferred to the Paulicians because of their patently Iconoclastic beliefs.⁵² It is through this association of Paulicianism with Iconoclasm that I should like to pursue this investigation.

The historical contact between the two movements is beyond doubt, as is the favor shown to the Paulicians by the Isaurian emperors. Not only was the heresiarch Genesios willing to come to Constantinople to discuss his beliefs with Leo III, but he satisfied him of his orthodoxy and was sent home with an imperial safe-conduct.⁵³ Even more favorable was the situation under Constantine V, whom some Byzantine sources accused of having been a Paulician himself. Reversing their usual policy of cooperation with the Arabs, the Paulicians under the leadership of Joseph fled for refuge to imperial territory in this period, and Joseph lived apparently undisturbed near Antioch of Pisidia until his natural death, *circa* 783.⁵⁴

We now know from the detailed study by W. E. Kaegi that the main support for Constantine's Iconoclastic program came not so much from the thematic armies, whose allegiances were erratic, thus incidentally suggesting that religious beliefs had little regional basis, as from the specially recruited and indoctrinated *tagmata* stationed in the capital. These were the soldiers who were to disturb the abortive Iconodule Council of the Holy Apostles, and who would have to be decoyed out of the capital and dismissed by the Empress Irene before the convocation of the Second Council of Nicaea.⁵⁵ In this con-

⁵¹ Obolensky, *The Bogomils*, 94; M. Wellnhofer, "Die thrakischen Euchiten," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 30 (1930), 479, 481f.; cf. Psellos, *De daem. op.*, PG, 122, col. 819ff., and *infra*, for a further discussion of the "Messalian" problem.

⁵² *Paulician Heresy*, 197-203; Gouillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclisme," 377.

⁵³ Petrus Siculus, xxix, PG, 104, cols. 1284 B-1285 A; cf. Grumel, *Regestes*, no. 336, p. 6. Many scholars, following J. K. L. Gieseler, "Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der Paulikianer," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, II (Hamburg, 1829), 89, have argued that Genesios fled from the Empire because he feared that his lies to the Emperor and the Patriarch would be unmasked. But the continuing favor of Leo III and of Constantine V toward the Paulicians, and the fact that Genesios' real doctrine was probably deliberately distorted by the polemical source used by Peter of Sicily, make such an interpretation unnecessary; see *Paulician Heresy*, 66, 175-77.

⁵⁴ *Paulician Heresy*, 122f., 136-38, etc.

⁵⁵ W. E. Kaegi, "The Byzantine Armies and Iconoclasm," *Byzantinoslavica*, 27 (1966), 48-70.

nexion, a remark in the Patriarch Nikephoros' unpublished *Refutatio et Eversio* is particularly tantalizing. The Patriarch says that Constantine V "had indoctrinated the army against the orthodox, and particularly those detachments which he had recruited for the capital from the herdsmen."⁵⁶ Since the sources make a special point of the fact that Joseph the Paulician and his companions had eluded the vigilance of Arab border detachments by pretending to drive their flocks from summer to winter pasturages, and since we likewise know that Constantine V in 752 was operating on the border of Mananali whence Joseph was fleeing, is it beyond the realm of possibility to suppose that some of the herdsmen enrolled for the Emperor's loyal and belligerently Iconoclastic *tagmata* were Joseph's Paulician followers?⁵⁷ Howsoever the case here, Nikephoros says explicitly in his third *Antirrheticus* that Constantine's soldiers dismissed by Irene in 786 had "wandered aimless as the planets," seeking an Iconoclastic sect until they came to rest among the "Manichaeans," by which we must understand the Paulicians.⁵⁸ Nearly a generation later, when some of the *tagmata* presumably recruited under the Emperor Nikephoros I broke into the Church of the Holy Apostles after Michael I's defeat at Versinikia in 813, and spread the rumor that Constantine V had risen from the grave, Theophanes Confessor calls the instigators of the sedition, Paulicians.⁵⁹ The *tagmata* seem, therefore, to have contained a considerable number of Paulicians in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.

The same seems to be true of some of the thematic armies at least, since the heresiarch Karbeas is said to have fled from Anatolikon with five thousand of his coreligionists, and there were Paulician officers on the staff of the *strategos* of Koloneia.⁶⁰ This service of Paulicians in the army and in the bureaucracy, where they were represented by the *proto a secretis* Lizix, casts additional light on the Isaurian policy toward them. Regular service, both military and civilian, required an oath from which heretics were barred by law. Hence, during this period the Paulicians cannot have been heterodox in the eyes of the imperial

⁵⁶ Nikephoros Patriarch, *Refutatio et eversio*, in Cod. Paris. Gr. 1250, fol. 195^r, l. 19 ff.: τί δ' ἄν τις εἴποι ὅπως τὸ στρατιωτικὸν ἅπαν κατὰ τοῦ ὀρθοδόξου μέρους ἐξέμνη; καὶ τοῦτον μάλιστα ὅσον κατὰ τὴν βασιλίδαν ἐκ τε τῶν αἰπολίων καὶ βουκολίων καὶ τῆς συοφορβίας κακῶς συνέλεξε καὶ ἐπὶ κοπρίᾳ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς κοπρίας τελουμένους διῆγεν, ὥσπερ μηχανὰς τινὰς καὶ πολέμια ὄργανα κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὀπλίτας . . . I am beholden for this passage to Professor Paul Alexander, to whom I take great pleasure in expressing my thanks for his kindness. Cf. *Nicephorus*, 247.

⁵⁷ Petrus Siculus, xxx, PG, 104, col. 1285 A: . . . ἔσχεν . . . μίσθιον αἶγας νέμοντα . . . ; xxxi, col. 1285 C; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxiv, PG, 130, col. 1193 B. On the campaign of Constantine V, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 427, 429.

⁵⁸ Nikephoros Patriarch, *Antirrheticus*, iii, PG, 100, col. 501 B: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν ὀλίγοις τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις, τῆς ἐπ' εὐσεβείᾳ γνωριζομένης, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν βασιλείου διεπούσης, ἀξιολήλων τε καὶ ἐνθεον σπουδῇν περὶ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπιδειξαμένης, ἐξήγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ θεοκρίτω ψήφῳ, τῆς πόλεως τῆσδε ἐφ' ἧς κακῶς καὶ ἀθέως παρὰ τοῦ ἡθροικότος ἐνίδρυντο, καλῶς καὶ αἰσίως ἐξώσθησαν· περιελώμενοι οἱ αὐτοὶ πλανήτες περιελήτουν θρησκείαν, καθ' ἣν εἰκόνες καὶ ὑπομνήματα τῆς Χριστοῦ οἰκονομίας οὐκ ἐμφανίζονται· εὐρίσκουσιν οὖν δὴ τὴν ἐρωμένην ἐκ πλείονος τὴν Μανιχαίων δὴ λέγω ἀπιστίαν καὶ ἀθεΐαν, καὶ τῇ δόξῃ τῇ ἐκείνων συνάδουσιν, καὶ τὰ κατὰ γνώμην αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρέπουσαν, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπαγγέλλουσιν οἵ περ ἦδοντο καὶ ἔχαιρον πόρρωθεν·

⁵⁹ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 501. The Iconoclastic bishop Anthony of Sylaeum is also called παραπλήσιος Παυλικιάνων in the Ps. *Epistola ad Theophilum*, PG, 95, col. 373 B.

⁶⁰ Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, 165 f.; "Skazaniia o 42 Amoriiskikh" muchlenikakh" i tserkovnaia sluzhba im," eds. V. Vasil'evsky and P. Nikitin, in *Zapiski Imperatorskoĭ Akademii Nauk* "po istoriko-filologicheskomu otdeleniiu, 8th Ser., 7.2 (1906), 27-30.

authorities.⁶¹ Karbeas' own career underlines again the close relationship between the Paulicians and the Iconoclasts. As I mentioned earlier, Karbeas, before his defection, had been *protomandator* of Theodotos Melissenos. A recent study of the imperial administration in this period shows that the *mandatores* or couriers were personally appointed by the *strategos* of the theme and were part of his immediate entourage as against the officials appointed by the crown.⁶² It seems incredible that Theodotos should have been totally unaware of the views of his senior courier and confidential agent, singled out by him and living in his household. At the same time, we know that the Melissenoi had Iconoclastic proclivities in this period: Theodotos himself had been raised to the supreme military dignity of στρατηγός τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν by the Iconoclastic Emperor Theophilos; among his relatives were to be found both Michael Melissenos, sent by Constantine V to enforce Iconoclasm in the Anatolic theme, and Theodotos' namesake, Theodotos Melissenos Kassiteras, the friend or evil genius of Leo V and the Iconoclastic successor of Nikephoros on the patriarchal throne in 815.⁶³

If any additional proof of the Iconoclastic Emperor's favor toward the Paulicians is needed, it is furnished by the immediate disgrace of the sectarians in moments of Iconodule reaction. Irene dismissed the old *tagmata* and had some executed; Michael I, at the urging of the Patriarch Nikephoros, decreed the death penalty against Paulicians; the frightful blood bath inaugurated by the Empress Theodora upon the reestablishment of Orthodoxy in 843 drove Karbeas and his supporters finally from the Empire and into open rebellion.⁶⁴ Thus unquestionably, the Paulicians were *personae gratae* to the Iconoclastic emperors and particularly to Constantine V, they were present in numbers in the capital both in the *tagmata* and in official posts, and the army seems to have been the main channel of their absorption into contemporary imperial society.

If the contact between Paulicians and Iconoclasts can be shown in physical terms, the same seems true on dogmatic grounds. The most obvious similarity is evidently to be found in the rejection of images by both parties, but the parallel can be carried into further detail. The Emperor Constantine V was persistently accused not only of having been a Paulician, but of having refused to the Virgin Mary the title of Theotokos, of having forbidden the cult of saints and relics, of even having gone so far as to reject the cross, all of which

⁶¹ *Cod. Th.*, XVI.v.25, 29, 42, 47, 61; *Nov. Val.*, XVIII.1.3; *CJ*, I.v.7, 8 (6), 12, 18; *Nov.*, XLV, CIX; *Basil.*, I.1.4, 23, 27, 30, 49, etc.; cf. N. G. Svoronos, "Le serment de fidélité à l'empereur byzantin et sa signification constitutionnelle," *Revue des études byzantines*, 9 (1951), 106-42. For Lizix, see *supra*, note 15. The subsequent existence of a special *tagma* of Manichaeans serving under the special regulations for *foederati* (see *supra*, note 19) suggests that they were not ordinarily eligible for regular army service.

⁶² Glykatzis-Ahrweiler, "Recherches," 37; cf. *supra*, note 60.

⁶³ C. Ducange, "Familles byzantines," *Corpus Byzantinae Historiae*, XXVI (Paris, 1680), 173. Theodotos Melissenos *strategos* of Anatolikon — Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, 165f.; Michael Melissenos—Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 440; Theodotos Melissenos Kassiteras—Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, 22-28; Genesios, *Basileia*, 11-15; Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1904), II, 777, 780; *et al.*; Grumel, *Regestes*, 40f.

⁶⁴ See *supra*, note 37f., and *Paulician Heresy*, 126-29.

are unmistakably Paulician traits, as was the Emperor's violent opposition to monasticism. Interestingly enough, none of these characteristics appear in the official conciliar Iconoclasm, nor would they manifest themselves in the Iconoclastic revival of the ninth century.⁶⁵ The most serious indictment, namely the accusation that the Emperor had called Christ a "mere man" normally born, that is to say, the charge of Paulician adoptionism, may be mere slander, or perhaps an earlier belief subsequently abandoned by Constantine, as the vehemence of his assertion of orthodoxy in a surviving fragment of his writings may suggest.⁶⁶ At times, the Emperor does seem to have been constrained to accept publicly the orthodox cult of the Theotokos and the saints, as evidenced in his first *Inquiry*, and in the *Definition* of the Iconoclastic Council of 754, which corrected and mitigated a number of the Emperor's statements. Nonetheless, when freed from restraint Constantine and his immediate agents, such as Michael Lachanodrakon *strategos* of Thrakesion, returned to the more extreme position, and we hear that the conciliar decisions in these matters became dead letter in the face of imperial edicts.⁶⁷ It is not my intention to re-

⁶⁵ On the opposition of Constantine V to the use of the term *Theotokos*, to relics, and to prayers to Mary and the saints, the sources are numerous, e.g., Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 415, 435, 446 = Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia*, CSHB (Bonn, 1842), 182–83 = Zonaras, *Annales*, PG, 135, col. 1328, cf. col. 1333; Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, II, 751; Nikephoros Patriarch, *Antirrheticus*, III, PG, 100, col. 344 A. Theostericus, "Vita Nicetae Medicensis," *ActaSS*, April, I, pp. xviii–xxvi; Stephanus Diaconus, *Vita S. Stephani Iunioris*, PG, 100, col. 1144 BC; *Adv. Constantinum Caballinum*, PG, 95, col. 337 CD; F. Dölger, ed., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* (Munich-Berlin, 1924), pt. I, p. 40, nos. 332, 333; *et al.* See, for a commentary, Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 195, and particularly Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 10–17, 50, and G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Breslau, 1929, repr. Amsterdam, 1964) (hereafter, *Studien*), 29–40.

On Constantine's rejection of the cross, see Νουθεσία γέροντος περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων, in B. M. Melioranskiĭ, *Georgii Kiprianin' i Ioann' Ierusalimlianin', dva maloizvēstnykh' bortsia za pravoslavie v' VIII vėkė* (St. Petersburg, 1901), xvi, and the "Vita Stephani Sugdanensis," in V. G. Vasil'evskii, *Trudy* (St. Petersburg, 1915), III, 72–98, also V. Grumel, "Les douzes chapitres contre les iconoclastes de S. Nicéphore de Constantinople," *Revue des études byzantines*, 17 (1959), 131.

On Constantine's well-known opposition to monasteries, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 437f., 445f.; Nikephoros Patriarch, *Antirrheticus*, III, PG, 100, cols. 493, 524 A, and *idem*, *Opuscula historica*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880), 58; Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. I, p. 40, no. 332, etc.; cf. E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London, 1930), 54–68, and Loos, "Mouvement I," 263–71. It is interesting to note that the persecution of monasteries is traced back to the period of Leo III by the Patriarch Germanos, *Narratio de sanctis synodis* . . . , PG, 98, col. 80 A–C, as well as other sources; cf. Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 10, note 1. On the halt of the persecution under Leo IV, see *ibid.*, 17f., and *infra*, note 67, for the Council's correction of Constantine's views. For the Paulician parallels, see *Paulician Heresy*, 41f., 154, 164–67, 169–72, and for the Bogomils, Cosmas, *Traité*, II, III, v, x, xi, xviii, xxvi, pp. 55, 58–61, 69–72, 84, 111f., as well as *Synodikon*, 61, 63.

⁶⁶ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 415: . . . εἶπε Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅτι μὴ λογίσῃ υἱὸν Θεοῦ εἶναι ὃν ἔτεκε Μαρία, τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν, εἰ μὴ φιλὸν ἀνθρώπων. ἡ γὰρ Μαρία αὐτὸν ἔτεκεν. ὡς ἔτεκεν ἐμὲ ἡ μήτηρ [μοῦ ἡ] Μαρία. I am less inclined to treat this passage as mere slander than is Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 35–37. Such views would be quite acceptable to contemporary Paulicians, some of whom were present at court, as we have already seen (cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 179f.), and Constantine V's protestations of orthodoxy (Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, p. 10f., frag. 23), sound rather strained. The main objection to this accusation is the implied Nestorianism of Constantine's assertion which does not fit in with the Monophysite tendencies often attributed to him, e.g., by Martin, *Iconoclastic Controversy*, 61, Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 44–53, Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 24–29, *et al.* However, the fragments of Constantine V quoted out of context and with polemical intent by the Patriarch Nikephoros are far from clear, so that the Monophysite thesis was categorically rejected by H. Grégoire in his review of Ostrogorsky's work, in *Byzantion*, 4 (1927–8), 765–71.

⁶⁷ Frag. I, 1, in Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 8; Hierieia Horos, Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, XIII (Florence, 1767), cols. 345 AB, 348 DE (= M. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955) (hereafter, "Council"), p. 185f., nos. 15, 17); cf.

surrect here the old thesis of the Paulician origin of Iconoclasm, but only to suggest that Paulician ideas could find their counterpart in court as against ecclesiastical circles, particularly among ultra-Iconoclastic groups.

These doctrinal connections are far more significant than external customs. As I noted before, Paulicianism in Byzantium underwent a transformation which affected its central doctrine. Greek polemicists, presenting a picture unlike that of the Armenian sources, accuse the Neo-Paulicians of rejecting the unity of the Godhead by saying that the Creator of this world is not to be identified with the Heavenly Father whose realm lies entirely in the future; of denying the reality of Christ's Incarnation, reserving the title Theotokos for the Heavenly Jerusalem; of rejecting the Old Testament and interpreting the Gospels allegorically to equate both the Eucharist and Baptism with God's words.⁶⁸ The traditional explanation for this doctrine, basing itself on the belief in two gods, has classified it as Manichaeism or Gnostic. But, even if we dismiss the heretics' own insistence that they were true Christians, we must still concede that the fantastic Gnostic cosmology is never met in the Neo-Paulician milieu, that all of their opponents grant that the heretics use exclusively orthodox Scriptures, whatever their interpretation, and that the *Synodikon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy*, while condemning their beliefs, never raises the issue of Gnostic affiliation.⁶⁹ The Christian and contemporary context of the transformation of Paulicianism should therefore not be ignored, especially since the alterations inaugurating the Neo-Paulician phase coincide chronologically with the period of greatest Iconoclastic influence on the sectarians: Sergios, the heresiarch invariably accused of being the innovator who cleft the sect in twain by his teaching, was precisely of an age to have been indoctrinated as a youth by Constantine V's faithful Iconoclasts scattered through the eastern provinces by Irene's persecution of 786, since Sergios' official assumption of the leadership of the Paulicians is usually dated from 801.⁷⁰

As it progressed from the mere restatement of the second commandment against graven images to a more elaborate theological and philosophical position, Iconoclasm found itself under fire for perverting the doctrine of the

Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 16-22, 27-29, 38, and Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 219, for the correction of Constantine's views by the Council of Hiereia. For the renewal of the persecution, see Dölger, *Regesten*, pt. I, p. 40, nos. 332, 333; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 437f., 440, 442, 445f., and, for the failure of the Council to impose its restraints on the Emperor, Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 33, 38.

⁶⁸ See *Paulician Heresy*, 41, note 66, 169-73, for the relevant authorities. Cf. Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 7f., 49, etc., and *idem*, *Liber invectivus contra haeresim . . . Phundagiatae . . .* (hereafter, *Liber*), PG, 131, col. 48 C, for the Messalians, and Vaillant-Puech, *Traité*, 28, 168ff., for the Bogomils.

⁶⁹ *Paulician Heresy*, 163, 172, 174; *Synodikon*, 55-69. Cf. Cosmas, *Traité*, xiiif., xxvi, pp. 72-77, 111, and Puech's commentary, 152-65, 313. The absence of the Manichaean cosmology from the Paulician doctrine was also observed by Loos, "Mouvement II," 56.

⁷⁰ Petrus Siculus, xxxiii, PG, 104, col. 1289 A, and xxxvi, col. 1293 B; cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 119, note 24. Peter's text emphasizes the fact that Sergios was a young man when he was infected with the heretical doctrine. The identification of Sergios' female teacher as "Manichaean", and the observation that Sergios had not been part of the Paulician milieu and was unacquainted with its leaders and tradition (Petrus Siculus, xl, PG, 104, col. 1300 C), are perfectly compatible with her being a refugee Iconoclast from the capital rather than a local Armenian Paulician. See *supra*, note 58, for the text of Nikephoros Patriarch associating the Iconoclastic soldiers exiled by Irene with the "Manichaeans" or Paulicians.

Incarnation. Because the Iconoclasts used against the making of images the argument that the Godhead was not to be circumscribed (ἀπερίγραπτος), their enemies accused them of denying Christ's humanity. This accusation of docetic Christology is reiterated by all the great Iconodule writers—John of Damascus, the Patriarch Nikephoros, Theodore the Studite, ultimately Photios—and it finds its official formulation in the first two anathemata of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*:

To those who admit verbally the Incarnation of the Divine Logos, but will not admit it in images, who pretend in words to accept, but in fact deny our salvation, anathema.

To those who through an evil attachment to the word uncircumscribable (ἀπερίγραπτος) do not represent our true God Jesus Christ who shared with us his body and blood, and thus clearly show themselves to be phantasiasts, anathema.⁷¹

The orthodoxy of the Iconoclastic position does not concern us here, but from its general tendency to stress the divinity of the Logos at the expense of Christ's humanity a totally spiritual and hence docetic Christology of the type attributed to the Neo-Paulicians could easily and logically be reached. The Paulicians used the very text of St. John (5:37): "Ye have never heard his voice nor seen his shape," quoted by the Iconoclastic Council of Hiereia in 754, and the gradual dehumanization of Christ incidentally manifests itself in his identification as an angel rather than a man among some Paulician groups.⁷² The same result could be achieved on the basis of another Iconoclastic premise, namely what has been called the "essential" concept of images stressed by Constantine V as well as by the Iconoclastic councils, whereby a true image

⁷¹ Frag. 5, in Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 8: ... οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνομεν ὅτι δυνατῶς ἔχει περιγράφεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ χαρακτηριστικόν ἐν πρόσωπόν ἐστι, καὶ ὁ περιγράφων τὸ πρόσωπον ἐκεῖνο, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν θείαν φύσιν περιέγραψεν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀπερίγραπτος. Frag. 17, *ibid.*, 10: ὁ εἰς ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐξ ἀμοιβῶν εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον λήξας, πῶς ἔχει εἰκονισθῆναι, τῆς μιᾶς φύσεως μὴ περιγραφομένης; cf. frags. 9, 11, 13, *ibid.*, 9. Hiereia Horos, Mansi, XIII, col. 337 C (= Anastos, "Council," p. 185, no. 9): Εἴ τις τὴν ἀπερίγραφον τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου οὐσίαν καὶ ὑπόστασιν διὰ τὸ σεσαρκῶσθαι ἐπιτηδεῖοι δι' ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀνθρωπομορφῶς περιγράφειν, καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον θεολογεῖ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἥττον καὶ μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν ἀπερίγραφον ὄντα, ἀνάθεμα. For the Iconodule sources, see *Paulician Heresy*, 197–200. *Synodikon*, p. 55, line 138ff.: Τοῖς λόγοις μὲν τὴν ἐνσαρκον οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου δεχομένοις, ὁρᾶν δὲ ταύτην δι' εἰκόνων οὐκ ἀνεχομένοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ῥήματι μὲν κατασχηματιζόμενοι, πράγματι δὲ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν ἀρνούμενοι, ἀνάθεμα.

Τοῖς τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ ἀπεριγράπτου κακῶς προσφωμένοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ βουλομένοις εἰκονογραφεῖσθαι τὸν παραπλησίον ἡμῖν σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος κεκοινωνηκότα Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν φαντασιασταῖς δεικνυμένοις, ἀνάθεμα. Cf. Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 178, 218, 244, 249; Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 25, 31; V. Grumel, "Recherches récentes sur l'iconoclasme," *Echos d'Orient*, 29 (1930), 100 *et passim*; *idem*, "Les douzes chapitres," 130–31; Gouillard, "Synodikon," 171, 176f.; and *idem*, "Fragments inédits d'un antirrhétique de Jean le Grammairien," *Revue des études byzantines*, 24 (1966) = *Mélanges Venance Grumel*, I (hereafter, "Fragments"), 173, 175–77.

⁷² Petrus Siculus, x, PG, 104, col. 1253 D: λέγουσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅτι Ὑμεῖς, φησὶ, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν κοσμοποιητὴν, ἡμεῖς δὲ εἰς ἐκεῖνον περὶ οὗ ἐν Εὐαγγελίοις ὁ Κύριος λέγει, ὅτι Οὐτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε, οὐτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἐωράκατε ... = Hiereia Horos, Mansi, XIII, col. 284 C. On the angel doctrine among the Paulicians, see Georgios Monachos in Codex Scorialensis 1 Φ 1, published by J. Friedrich, "Der ursprüngliche bei Georgios Monachos nur theilweise erhaltene Bericht über die Paulikianer," *SBMünch.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1896 (1897), p. 76, no. xx; Paulician Abjuration Formula in G. Ficker ed., "Eine Sammlung von Abschwörungsformeln," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 27 (1906) (hereafter, "Paulician Formula"), p. 454, no. 11; and *Synodikon*, 61, with Gouillard's commentary, 231.

The existence of such a link between Neo-Paulician docetism and a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Iconoclastic position is further supported by the heretics' share in the essential concept of icons. As the Iconoclasts maintained that the Eucharist was the only possible icon of Christ, so the Paulicians, taking the argument one step further, went on to say that far from being material bread and wine the true Eucharist was to be found in Christ's teachings; obviously, only the divine words could be consubstantial with the Logos.⁷⁵ Similarly, the condemnation found in the Paulician treatise known as the *Key of Truth* against those who "have denied the precious mediation . . . of the . . . Son of God and have followed after dead things and especially images . . . , which is contrary to the Godhead," seems an echo of the strictures of both the Iconoclastic Councils of Hiereia and St. Sophia against those who insult the glory of the Virgin and of the saints by depicting them with lifeless colors and dead images.⁷⁶ Moreover, the Iconoclastic "essential" or "ethical" view that the

⁷⁶ *Key of Truth*, 53f.:...*ոմանք ուրացեալ են զպատուական միջնորդութիւն ...որդոյն աստուծոյ, եւհետեւեալ են մեռելոց եւ մանաւանդ պատկերաց . . . որք սոքա ամենեքեան են հալառակ աստուածութեան* (trans., *ibid.*, 115). Cf. Hiereia Horos, Mansi, XIII, cols. 276 D, 345 CD: Εἰ τις τὰς τῶν ἀπάντων ἁγίων ἰδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχοις καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὕλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναδηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύει, μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας· ματαία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδεύσεως αἵρεσις· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἶόν τινας ἐμψύχους εἰκόνας ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναλωγραφεῖ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἐκ τούτου διεγείρεται λῆλον, καθὼς οἱ ἔνθεοι ἡμῶν ἔφησαν πατέρες, ἀνάθεμα. St. Sophia Horos, Alexander, “St. Sophia,” p. 59, frag. 9: τὴν τε παναγίαν Θεοτόκον καὶ τοὺς συμμόρφους αὐτοῦ ἁγίους νεκραῖς χαρακτῆρας ὤψουν ἀναστηλοῦν καὶ προσκυνεῖν· ἀπαρκαφυλάκτως ἐξέθετο, εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ καίριον δόγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσκόψασα. καὶ τὴν λατρευτικὴν ἡμῶν προσκύνησιν ἐπιθολώσασα τὰ πῶ Θεῷ πρέποντα τῇ ἀψύχῳ ὕλῃ τῶν εἰκόνων προσάγεσθαι κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐβεβαίωσεν. Cf. also *ibid.*, frag. 13.

only suitable image of the saints "sharing Christ's form" was the imitation of their virtues, could easily be reconciled with the Paulician belief that the men who equalled Jesus' virtue might also be adopted through an act of grace as sons of God.⁷⁷ Finally, from a wholly spiritual concept of Christ, the identification of his mother with the Heavenly Jerusalem and not with a living woman became inescapable.

In the same fashion, the Neo-Paulician rejection of the material world can readily be derived from an overstatement of Iconoclastic beliefs. The spiritualization of doctrine by the Iconoclasts necessarily tended to push the Heavenly Kingdom further from this world, and their contempt for "dead" and "soulless" images, and for those who dare represent "the intangible Son and Word of God through dishonorable matter (δι' ατίμου ὕλης)," give ample ground for their own repeated condemnation by the Iconodules as self-confessed Manichaeans through this rejection of matter.⁷⁸

One last aspect of Neo-Paulicianism is interesting in this context: the insistence that the reign of the true God, the Heavenly Father, lay exclusively in the future. A temporal element was thus an integral part of their dualism.⁷⁹ Now the trichotomy of Origen, the progression from the world of shadows of the Old Dispensation, before the Incarnation, to the world of images of the New, and the reality yet to be, is constantly present in the discussion between Iconoclasts and Iconodules. Stress was laid on the opposition between the rule of Law represented in the Old Testament and the Grace represented in the New which still necessarily fell short of the future when the Glory of God would be seen "face to face."⁸⁰ The Iconoclasts found themselves in difficulty, as their enemies gleefully pointed out, in that they accepted the Old Testament texts

⁷⁷ Hiereia Horos, Mansi, XIII, col. 345 AB; P. Alexander, "An Ascetic Sect of Iconoclasts in VII Century Armenia," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), 158f.; *idem*, *Nicephorus*, 216–22, and "St. Sophia," 43–45, 51; Anastos, "Council," 183; *idem* "Ethical Theory." Cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 152, 159, 211f., etc., for the Armenian Paulician adoptionism, and "Paulician Formula," p. 454, no. 11, for its presence in Byzantium.

⁷⁸ See note 76; also Hiereia Horos, Mansi, XIII, col. 221 CD: τῆς κακίας δημιουργὸς . . . ὥστε ὑπὸ χεῖρα δι' ἀπάτης ἑαυτῷ ποιῆσαι τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· ἀλλ' ἐν προσχήματι Χριστιανισμοῦ τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν κατὰ τὸ λεληθὸς ἐπανήγαγε, πείσας τοῖς ἰδίοις σοφίσμασι τοὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁρῶντας μὴ ἀποστήναι τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλὰ ταύτην προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην σέβεσθαι, καὶ Θεὸν τὸ ποίημα οἶεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κλήσει ἐπνομαζόμενον. St. Sophia Horos, Alexander, "St. Sophia," p. 59, frag. 8: τὸν ἀκατάληπτον Ὑιὸν καὶ Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν δι' ατίμου ὕλης ζωγραφεῖν ἐδογματίσῃ . . . The tone of the rebuttal was set at once by St. John Damascene, *Orationes apologeticae adversus eos qui sacras imagines abjiciunt*, I, PG, 94, col. 1245 C: Μὴ κάκιζε τὴν ὕλην οὐ γὰρ ἄτιμος. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄτιμον ὁ παρὰ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται. Τῶν Μανιχαίων τοῦτο τὸ φρόνημα. = col. 1252; II, *ibid.*, col. 1297 C; III, *ibid.*, col. 1332 B; *Dialogus contra Manichaeos*, PG, 94, cols. 1508, 1520, 1528, etc., and it is then repeated by all the main Iconodule writers, cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 198–201, Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 31; Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 216, 218, etc. Note also the accusation made against the Armenian Paulicians that they claimed, "We are not worshippers of matter but of God [*Ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ὑλῆς ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρεύομεν*]," Gregory Magistros, *T'it'era* (*Letters*), ed. K. Kostaneanç (Alexandropol, 1910), 157.

⁷⁹ Petrus Hegumenus, Πέτρου ἐλαχίστου μοναχοῦ Ἡγουμένου περὶ Παυλικιανῶν τῶν καὶ Μανιχαίων, in *Appendix ad Petri Siculi historiam Manichaeorum seu Paulicianorum*, ed. J. C. L. Giesler (Göttingen, [1849]) (hereafter Petrus Hegumenus), p. 63, vi: φασιν, ἕτερον Θεὸν λέγομεν ὑπάρχειν τὸν πατέρα τὸν ἐπουράνιον, ὃς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. = Petrus Siculus, x, PG, 104, col. 1253 BC, etc.; cf. Puech, *Traité*, 323, on Bogomil dualism.

⁸⁰ I Cor. 13:12: βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον. See Ladner, "The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," 18f., and next note.

on the prophetic visions, but denied the reality of what has been seen.⁸¹ A more coherent if more heterodox position would reject the Old Testament altogether, it might slight the present world of symbols and enigma, and focus its entire allegiance on the unobscured reality to come. These are the very implications in the Neo-Paulicians' rejection of the Old Testament accepted by their Armenian coreligionists, their denigration of the present, and their single-minded devotion to the Heavenly Lord of the future.⁸² Later perversions along the same line might well claim that not God but Satan was the creator of an imperfect and contemptible world, without requiring the injection of any foreign beliefs.⁸³ In the light of such possible transformation and adaptation of Paulician dogma in extremist Iconoclastic circles, the long debated characterization by the Patriarch Theophylaktos Lekapenos of the new, tenth-century, Bogomil heresy, clearly related dogmatically to Neo-Paulicianism, as a mixture of Paulianism (*i.e.*, the older Paulician tradition) with Manichaeism (by which the Patriarch along with the Iconodules meant Iconoclasm) would appear to be rigorously correct.⁸⁴

A little more than a century after Theophylaktos, the princess Anna Comnena was to redefine Bogomilism as having linked the impiety (δυσσέβεια) of the Paulicians with the loathsomeness (βδελυρία) of the Messalians.⁸⁵ Far from

⁸¹ *Synodikon*, p. 55, lines 145–50: Τοῖς τὰς μὲν προφητικὰς ὁράσεις, κὰν μὴ βούλοιτο, παραδεχομένοις, τὰς δ' ὀφθείσας αὐτοῖς εἰκονογραφίας, ὧ θαῦμα, καὶ πρὸ σαρκώσεως τοῦ Λόγου, μὴ καταδεχομένοις, ἀλλ' ἡ αὐτὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἀληπτόν τε καὶ ἀόρατον οὐσίαν ὀφθῆναι τοῖς τεθεσμένοις κενολογοῦσιν, ἡ εἰκόνα μὲν ταῦτα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τύπους καὶ σχήματα ἐμφανισθῆναι τοῖς ἐωρακόσι συντιθεμένοις, εἰκονογραφεῖν δὲ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα τὸν Λόγον καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ πάθη οὐκ ἀνεχομένοις, ἀνάθεμα. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51, lines 82–97; p. 55, lines 151–58, with Gouillard's commentary, 169 ff.; and Cosmas, *Traité*, 72. In his article, "Fragments," 174 f., especially 174, note 20, Gouillard observes the Iconoclastic difficulty with the Origenist trichotomy. The simpler, albeit heretical, solution suggested below would solve the problem by downgrading the present world along with the past; cf. also *ibid.*, 177 f.

⁸² *Paulician Heresy*, 171, note 115, for the Greek authorities, as against 155, 164, for the attitude of the Armenian Paulicians; see also Cosmas, *Traité*, ix, p. 68; xii, p. 72; xxvi, p. 111, and Puech's commentary, 173, for the Bogomil position.

⁸³ "Paulician Formula," p. 453, no. 1: Ἀνάθεμα τοῖς τὸν προαιώνιον Θεὸν ἡμῶν Σατανᾶν ὀνομάζουσιν, and p. 454, no. 8: Ἀνάθεμα τοῖς Σατανᾶν ὀνομάζουσιν τὸν τῶν ὄλων δημιουργὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ πλασθῆναι παρὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ δογματίζουσιν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ῥινῶν εἰς τὸ σκῆνωμα εἰσαχθεῖσαν λοιδοροῦσι καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἀφαιρεθῆναι κενολογοῦσιν = Georgios Monachos, in *Codex Scorialensis* (*supra*, note 72), 72 f. For the Bogomil and Messalian view, see Cosmas, *Traité*, xiii, pp. 74 f., 77, xvii–xviii, pp. 83–85, xxvi, p. 111; Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 8, 94, 96, 98, with Ficker's commentary, 252 ff.; M. Loos, "Le prétendu témoignage d'un traité de Jean Exarque intitulé 'Šestodnev' et relatif aux Bogomiles," *Byzantinoslavica*, 13 (1952–53) (hereafter, "Šestodnev"), 59–67; *idem*, "Certains aspects du bogomilisme byzantin des 11^e et 12^e siècles," *Byzantinoslavica*, 28 (1967), 39–51; Obolensky, *The Bogomils*, 174–80; *et al.*

⁸⁴ Theophylaktos Lekapenos in "L'epistola sui Bogomili del patriarca costantinopolitano Teofilatto," ed. I. Dujčev *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, II (Vatican City, 1964), 89, line 33 f. (= Grumel, *Regestes*, p. 223, no. 789): Μανιχαϊσμός γάρ ἐστι παυλιανισμῷ συμμιγῆς ἢ τούτων δυσσέβεια. Theophylakt's use of the term "Paulianism" instead of Paulicianism still troubles scholars, as for example: Bart'ikyan, *Istochniki*, 26–31, Lipshits, *Ocherki*, 140, and Gouillard, "Hérésie," 308, 316, but it presents no difficulty if we accept the thesis of an original Paulician adoptionism subsequently perverted in Iconoclast "Manichaean" circles. Cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 182 f., 211–16.

⁸⁵ *Alexiade*, XV. viii. 1: Δύο γὰρ δόγματα συνελθῆτην κάκιστα καὶ φαυλότατα ἐγνωσμένα τοῖς πάλαι χρόνοις, Μανιχαίων τε, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, δυσσέβεια, ἣν καὶ Παυλικιανῶν αἵρεσιν εἵπομεν, καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν βδελυρία. Τοιοῦτον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ τῶν Βογομίλων δόγμα, ἐκ Μασσαλιανῶν καὶ Μανιχαίων συνκείμενον. Cf. Cedrenus, *Compendium*, I, 514, 516, 547; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, col. 1289 D: Ἡ τῶν Βογομίλων αἵρεσις ... μέρος οὕσα τῆς τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν, καὶ συμφορομένη τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμασι ...; *idem*, *Confutatio*, PG, 130, col. 40; *Synodikon*, 65; Puech, *Traité*, 293–99, cf. M. Jugie, "Phoundagiagites et Bogomiles," *Echos d'Orient*, 12 (1909), 259. Euthymius Peribleptae, *Liber*, PG,

adding a new and problematic element to an already complicated subject, Anna's characterization may supply us with one more lead in the study of the gradual spiritualization of the Paulicians. A number of years ago already, Father Florovsky observed the Origenist substratum of much Iconoclastic thought.⁸⁶ But Origen's distinction between "somatic" and "pneumatic" Christianity, his belief that Jesus' humanity had been exalted to a higher perfection in an intimate blending with his divinity, that "Christ's external outlook depended upon the measure of ability to receive him," and that "if He was truly man, He is now man no more, and therefore we also are no more men when we follow His words, for He, as the protokos of all men, has transformed us into God," were not perpetuated exclusively in Iconoclastic circles.⁸⁷ They had long been part and parcel of the Byzantine mystical tradition which was reaching one of its most outstanding formulations in the works of Symeon the New Theologian in the early eleventh century, at the very time when Bogomilism was spreading through Bulgaria. The doctrine of the deification of man (θεωσις) was furthermore fully compatible with the Paulician dogma of the adoption of Jesus and hence potentially of all mankind.⁸⁸ It would be

131, col. 56 D, identifies the Messalians with the Paulicians, while in the version of the *Ep. inv.*, 58–62, he revives the memory of the controversy between Mani and Archelaus found in Peter of Sicily and the Pseudo-Photius, though the association of the later heretics with Manichaeans was dying out, according to Puech, *Traité*, 294.

⁸⁶ G. Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History*, 19 (1950) (hereafter, "Iconoclastic Controversy"), 77–96; Alexander, "St. Sophia," 51. Cf. I. Hausherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1 (1935) (hereafter, "Spiritualité"), 123f., 125, for the claims of Evagrius Ponticus.

⁸⁷ Florovsky, "Iconoclastic Controversy," 90f. See also M. Lot-Borodine, "La doctrine de la déification dans l'Eglise grecque jusqu'au XI^e siècle" (hereafter, "Déification"), *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 105–106 (1932), 531 *et passim*, and the next note.

⁸⁸ For the persistent tradition of Byzantine mysticism, see Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 114–38; Lot-Borodine, "Déification" *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 105–106 (1932), 5–43, 525–74; 107–108 (1933), 8–55; M. Viller, "Aux sources de la spiritualité de Saint Maxime," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 11 (1930) 156–84, 239–68, 331–36; M. Disdier, "Les fondements dogmatiques de la spiritualité de saint Maxime le Confesseur," *Echos d'Orient*, 29 (1930) (hereafter, "S. Maxime"), 296–313; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 344–68; M. Jugie, "Les origines de la méthode d'oraison des hésychastes," *Echos d'Orient*, 30 (1931) (hereafter, "Oraison"), 179–85; G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); *et al.*

Both Puech, *Traité*, 161–65, 293ff., 327–36, and Gouillard, "Hérésie," 319–23, see the renaissance of "Messalianism" within the context of the mystical tradition. See also Gouillard, *ibid.*, 319, note 85, for the multiple connotations of the term Messalian, and I. Hausherr, "L'erreur fondamentale et la logique du Messalianisme," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1 (1935) (hereafter, "Erreur"), 328–60, on some of the fundamental problems touched by Messalianism. Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 126–28, moreover, very rightly notes that similar beliefs and even terminology could be shared by the orthodox and the heretics. Thus, the shedding by the true Christian of the "garment of skins," the χιτῶνες δερμάτων of Gen. 3:21, to be replaced by the true image of God, can be traced from the Scriptures, through the mystics (cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Cantica Cantic. Hom.*, x, in J. Daniélou, and H. Musurillo, *From Glory to Glory, Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings* [New York, 1961], 250–52, and G. Ladner, "The Philosophical Anthropology of Saint Gregory of Nyssa," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 12 [1958], 88ff.; *idem*, *The Idea of Reform*, 176 and note 27; Disdier, "S. Maxime," 297; Lot-Borodine, "Déification," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 107–108, 34ff.; J. Darrouzès ed. and trans., *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Chapitres théologiques, gnostiques et pratiques* [Paris, 1957] [hereafter Symeon, *Kephalaia*], I. 53, 90, II. 8, 17, III. 11, 43; J. Gouillard, "Syméon le Jeune, le Théologien ou le Nouveau Théologien," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XIV.2 [1941], col. 2948) to the heretics (cf. Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, col. 1317 C). At the same time, Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 130, perceptively noted that the condemnation of Origenism necessarily cast a pall of doubt on part of the mystical tradition. The adoption of the anti-Origenist Dorotheus by

an oversimplification and a distortion to turn Symeon the New Theologian into an Iconoclast, although his defense of orthodox images in his quarrel with Stephen of Nicomedia is hardly reconcilable with his systematic denigration of the visible and material world, nor should he be turned into a Paulician; but the dogmatic views reflected in his writings, particularly in the *Theological, Gnostic, and Practical Kephalaia*, often show a startling similarity to Neo-Paulician and Bogomil beliefs.⁸⁹

The total devotion to a pneumatic Christianity seeking an invisible God through the eyes of the spirit and scorning the visible world as "mud or smoke,"⁹⁰ the striving of the true Christian "to know the things of the future"

Theodore the Studite (*ibid.*, 131), as against the Origenism of the Iconoclasts, and Gouillard's observation, "Synodikon," 180 (cf. Lot-Borodine, "Déification," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 107–108, 19 ff.) that Iconodulism and the mystical tradition are ultimately incompatible, raises the interesting possibility of a tacit continuity between the two controversies. For the later eleventh-century mystics too the crucial problem of the "true" image with all its implications remains as central as for their predecessors.

As early as the eighth century, St. John Damascene observed the presence among the monks of various sectarians, whom he calls *Aposchistai* or *Doxarioi* and whom he identifies with *Euchitai* or Messalians as well as with Iconoclasts: *De haeresibus compendium* . . . , PG, 94, cols. 776 A–777 B. The continuation of a "Messalian" tradition in monastic surroundings can be traced through Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1288 C; Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 6–8, 26 f.; idem, *Liber*, PG, 131, col. 48 C; Cosmas, *Traité*, xv, p. 81, and Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, X.1.6, on Blachernites. In this connexion Puech, *Traité*, 293, interestingly observed that although Euthymius Peribleptae (*Ep. inv.*, 62), was acquainted with St. John Damascene's description of classic Messalianism in the *De haeresibus*, cols. 728 A–737 C, he failed to note any similarity between the earlier sect and the "Messalian" Phundagiagites whom he was discussing.

For the long tradition of adoptionism or deification (θεωσις) in orthodox Greek theology ultimately going back to the Gospel of St. John and the Pauline Epistles, see Lot-Borodine, "Déification," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 105–106, 31 ff., *et passim*; Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, col. 2948, and Ladner, "The Philosophical Anthropology of St. Gregory of Nyssa," 59–94, and especially 61, note 2, for the bibliography. Cf. above note 77 for the Paulician adoptionism.

In view of Symeon the New Theologian's many spiritual predecessors, his beliefs are hardly innovations, nevertheless the chronological synchronism between his reaffirmation of the mystical tradition and the spread of Bogomilism seems worth noting. Symeon was born *ca.* 949 and died on 12 March, 1022, see I. Hausherr ed. and trans., *Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien (949–1022) par Nicétas Stéthatos* (Rome, 1928) (hereafter, Symeon, *Vita*), and Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, col. 2942. According to Vaillant, *Traité*, 24, Cosmas' work was written immediately after 972, and Loos, "Šestodnev," 60–62, 67, has effectively disproved the thesis for an earlier appearance of Bogomilism in Bulgaria. Hence, we must return to the period given by Cosmas himself, *Traité*, I, p. 54, "sous le règne du bon chrétien l'empereur Pierre [927–969]," or, in other words, during Symeon's lifetime.

⁸⁹ Symeon, *Vita*, LXXII, LXXXI–XCIV, pp. 98, 110–28, and Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, col. 2943, for Symeon's Iconodulism, though, even here, note that Symeon's apology to the synkellos (*Vita*, LXXXIV, p. 116) brings us very close to the Iconoclastic concept of "ethical images"; see *supra*, p. 103 f. and note 77. For his scorn of the visible world, see Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.1–3, 10, 13, 17; II.22 *et passim*, as well as the next two notes. Cf. the first fragment of John the Grammarian in Gouillard, "Fragments," 171, 174, for a passage on the vision of the eternal life which Symeon would not have disavowed. The mystics' tripartite progression: asceticism, contemplation, divine vision, makes again for a contempt of the visible world entirely acceptable to the Neo-Paulician tradition; cf. Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 122 f. The influence of the particular current within the mystical tradition in which asceticism is the corollary of contemplation may serve to explain the contrast between Bogomil spirituality and asceticism and the Paulician secular character, which has so often puzzled scholars. On the other hand, in the particular tradition of which Symeon was the spokesman, asceticism was only an ancillary means to *apatheia*. See Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, col. 2954–57, and Hausherr, "Spiritualité," especially 128, 133 f., on the "mystical" as against the "ascetic" tradition. In this case the Paulicians' disregard of asceticism might also be vindicated.

⁹⁰ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.1, 24, 38, 39, 41, 62, and 101: 'Ὅποταν ὑπεράνω τῆς τοῦ σώματος ταπεινώσεως γένῃ διὰ πόνων καὶ ἰδρώτων πολλῶν καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδύς ἀναγκῶν, κοῦφον αὐτὸ καὶ ὡς πνευματικὸν περιφέρῃς, ὥς μήτε κόπῳ μήτε πείνῃς μήτε δίψῃς ἀισθόμενον, καὶ τηνικαῦτα κρεῖττον ἐσόπτρου βλέπεις τὸν

through “detachment from the present,”⁹¹ the stress on Christ as “the end of the law,”⁹² the heavy reliance on the Pauline Epistles,⁹³ all suggest parallel mental processes. Symeon’s rejection of hierarchical jurisdiction, reserving authority exclusively for the pure in heart echoes the Paulician and Bogomil scorn for the official Church,⁹⁴ while his continuous prayers leading to the detachment or *apatheia* prerequisite for the divine vision are reminiscent of the practices of some Bogomil communities.⁹⁵ The belief that God created two worlds, one visible and sensible, the other invisible and intelligible, “there being no union, knowledge, or communion between the two,” and that the body belongs to the former while the soul pertains to the latter, takes us a long way along the path toward dualism.⁹⁶ The traditional mystical union of the spiritual Christian with God through grace and imitation, through *Christomimesis*, the wearing of the “celestial image” which transforms the believer “to Christ’s perfect measure,”⁹⁷ through the communion of the saints who share

ὑπὲρ νοῦν καὶ ἀνακεκαλυμμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς διακρύβων ὁρᾶς ὃν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε . . . ; II.2, 3, 19; III.11, 42, 44. *Ibid.*, I.10: . . . πηλὸν ἢ καπνὸν ἅπαντα τὰ ὁρώμενα καθαροῦν; cf. Symeon, *Vita*, xxixf., also note *Kephalaia*, II.2 (I Cor. 2:9): “Α γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε . . . ; cf. John 5:37 and *supra*, note 72.

⁹¹ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.2 and 13: ὁ δὲ αἶετ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων γινώσκει σπουδάζων πρῶτον πάντων ἑαυτὸν ἀποστερήσαι τῶν παρόντων ὀφείλει; also I.77–79, 101; II.15, 16; III.35, 36, 61–63. Cf. Puech, *Traité*, 161–63, 299, and *supra*, note 89.

⁹² Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.9: Τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός (Rom. 10:4); cf. II.15–17, and I, 63, 64, 70, and especially 101, for the Pauline progression (I Cor. 13:12), and *supra*, notes 80, 89. This progression is indeed an integral part of the mystical tradition, as observed by Hausherr, “Spiritualité,” 122f.

⁹³ The Pauline citations make up 60 out of a total of 169 quotations preponderantly from the New Testament found in the *Kephalaia*; cf. Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, col. 2947, and the preceding note. The avowed attachment of the Paulicians to St. Paul was one of their distinguishing characteristics.

⁹⁴ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.4, 24–30, 39, 54, 58–62; II.5, 10, 15, 16; III.4, 6, *et passim*; Symeon, *Vita*, xxii, xlii, etc., and Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, cols. 2943, 2951. See Petrus Hegumenus, p. 66, xiv; Petrus Siculus, x, PG, 104, col. 1257 B; “Paulician Formula,” p. 454, nos. 13, 14; and *Key of Truth*, chap. viii f., pp. 16f. (text), 83–85 (trans.), for the Paulician rejection of the orthodox hierarchy, and Cosmas, *Traité*, viii, pp. 64–67, xv, p. 81, for the Bogomils. On the Origenist antecedents of this point of view, see Hausherr, “Spiritualité,” 138.

⁹⁵ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.32, 35, 49, 77, 101; III.20, 21, 25, and especially 100, for the necessary prayers, tears, and contemplation needed to reach *apatheia*, for which see, *ibid.*, I.49, 77–80; II.19; III.20, 21, 25, 37, 41, 42, etc.; also Symeon, *Vita*, xxv–xxviii, xxx, xxxvi, etc.; cf. Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, cols. 2954–57. For the Bogomil prayers, see Cosmas, *Traité*, xvii, p. 82f., and Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, cols. 1313 D–1316 A; and for the Messalian belief in the efficacy of prayers, *ibid.*, xxvi, col. 1277 A.

⁹⁶ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, II.22–25: ‘Ο Θεὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς δύο κόσμους πεποίηκεν, ὁρατὸν καὶ ἀόρατον, ἕνα δὲ βασιλέα τῶν ὁρωμένων τῶν δύο κόσμων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας ἐπιφερόμενον κατὰ γε τὸ ὁρώμενον καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ νοούμενον. Τούτοις καταλλήλως καὶ δύο ἐπιλάμπουσιν ἥλιοι, αἰσθητὸς οὗτος καὶ νοητὸς ἄλλος· καὶ ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ὁρωμένοις καὶ αἰσθητοῖς ἥλιος, τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς ἀόρατοις καὶ νοητοῖς Θεός, . . . μηδεμίαν ἐχόντων πρὸς ἀλλήλα ἐνωσιν ἢ γινῶσιν ἢ κοινωνίαν τὸ σύνολον, μήτε τῶν νοητῶν πρὸς τὰ αἰσθητά, μήτε τῶν αἰσθητῶν πρὸς τὰ νοητά . . . ὥσπερ γοῦν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ κόσμοις οἱ δύο ταῖς ἐνεργείαις διαμερίζονται ἥλιοι, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ ἀνθρώπῳ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα, ὃ δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιλάμπει . . . ; Symeon’s formulation includes the one God, master of both worlds, but the passage could easily receive a heterodox interpretation, and is disturbingly close to the Phundagiagite doctrine cited by Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 34: δύο μόνον λέγοντες εἶναι τοῦτω τῷ ὁρωμένῳ κόσμῳ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δημιουργίας· τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν . . . , where the sun is also the creation of God. Cf. Psellos, *De daem. op.*, ii, PG, 122, cols. 824/5; Puech, *Traité*, 162, 182; and “Paulician Formula,” p. 454, no. 8 (*supra*, note 83).

⁹⁷ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.53, 54: ‘Ο μὴ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἐπουρανίου, ἀνθρώπου τε καὶ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ λογικῷ καὶ νοερῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εὐαισθητῶς καὶ γνωστῶς ἐνδυσάμενος, αἷμα μόνον ἔστιν ἔτι καὶ σὰρξ, . . . Ὁ ἀκούων οὕτως καὶ βλέπων καὶ αἰθανόμενος οἶδε τῶν λεγομένων τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς ἤδη τὴν εἰκόνα φορέσας τοῦ ἐπουρανίου (I Cor. 15:49) καὶ εἰς ἀνδρα τέλειον ἀνελθὼν τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ephes. 4:13). Cf. II.8; III.43, 88, and next note.

in the divine glory until "we dwell in God and he in us who are called by adoption Gods and sons of God," is again consonant with Iconoclastic essential or ethical concepts, but even more with Paulician adoptionism.⁹⁸ The very worship accorded by the New Theologian to his "spiritual father" Symeon the Studite, in whom he saw Christ Himself, which caused him such difficulties with the ecclesiastical authorities, is a precise counterpart of the Paulician reverence for their own heresiarchs as spiritual fathers, *isapostoloi* and Christs.⁹⁹

Symeon's belief in two baptisms, of which "the first baptism of water" is but a prefiguration, while "the second [spiritual] baptism is no longer a symbol of the truth, but the truth itself,"¹⁰⁰ brings to mind both the Neo-Paulician rejection of orthodox baptism with the quotation of Christ's words, "I am the living water" (John 4:10), and the Bogomil baptism of the spirit condemned in the eleventh century.¹⁰¹ Symeon's insistence that the reception of the spirit must be conscious tacitly denies the validity of child baptism, explicitly repudiated by the Bogomils and the Paulicians.¹⁰² The very words through

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, I. 65: 'Ο Θεός ἐξ ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐπιζητεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . ἀλλὰ φυλακὴ ἀπαράβατος τῆς εἰκόνης καὶ τοῦ ἀνωθεν ἀξιώματος, ἐν οἷς, κατὰ φύσιν ἐστῶτες καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα φοροῦντες λελαμπρυσμένον τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένομεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, θέσει Θεοὶ καὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ χρηματίζοντες, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ σημειούμενοι (Ps. 4:7), also I. 101; II. 10; III. 4, 6, and 81: . . . υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ (Θεοῦ) χάριτι καὶ συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ. Cf. Disdier, "S. Maxime," 303, 304, 313, and Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 122–23, for the long tradition of this spiritual adoptionism.

⁹⁹ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I. 28: 'Ο πίστιν κτησάμενος ἐναργῆ πρὸς τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, βλέπων αὐτόν, αὐτὸν βλέπει λογίζεται τὸν Χριστόν: καὶ συνὼν ἢ ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ, Χριστῷ συνεῖναι καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν βεβαίως πιστεύει. Also I. 24, 30, 55, 62; II. 10; III. 4–6, 87; Symeon, *Vita*, XLIX, LXXXVII–XCIV, CX, CXXIV, pp. 60, 98–128, 152, 178; Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV. 2, col. 2943. Cf. *Paulician Heresy*, 154, 156, 161 f., 166 f., 175, 184 f., 212, for the Paulician adoration of their leaders.

¹⁰⁰ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I. 35 and 36: Τὸ πρότερον βάπτισμα ἔχει τὸ ὕδωρ προϋπογράφον τὰ δάκρυα, ἔχει τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος προσημαίνον τὸ νοητὸν μύρον τοῦ Πνεύματος. Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον οὐκέτι τύπος τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀλήθεια. Also III. 45. Cf. Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 25, 37, 72f.; *idem*, *Liber*, PG, 131, col. 56 B; Hausherr, "Erreur," 329, 336–38. Note the reading of the prologue of the Gospel of St. John at the heretical spiritual baptism, Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 24 f.; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, col. 1313 B, and Lot-Borodine, "Déification," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 107–108, 25, for the "grace of tears" which are the "living water" of Symeon's second baptism. See also next note.

¹⁰¹ Petrus Siculus, xxix, PG, 104, col. 1284 D: Καὶ περὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὁμοίως ἔλεγε, τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ὑπάρχειν τὸ βάπτισμα, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο, διότι γέγραπται: Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν (Joh. 4:10) = Petrus Hegumenus, p. 65, xii: Βάπτισμα δὲ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, καθὼς φησιν ὁ Κύριος: ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν, and "Paulician Formula," p. 453, no. 4, p. 455, no. 17; cf. Symeon, *Kephalaia*, II. 18: Οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ ὁ βυθὸς τῶν τῆς θαλάσσης ὑδάτων, οὕτω καὶ ὁ βυθὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλ' ὕδωρ ὑπάρχει ζῶν αἰωνίου ζωῆς. For the rejection of orthodox baptism by the Paulicians, see *Paulician Heresy*, 152 f., 156, 159 f., etc. For the Bogomils, Messalians, and Phundagiagites, see Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1276 D, xvii, col. 1313 B; Cosmas, *Traité*, xv, p. 81 f., with Puech's commentary, 250–60, based on Euthymius Zigabenus and Euthymius Peribleptae; *Synodikon*, 67, 69.

On Symeon's stress on consciousness, its antecedents and possible implications, cf. Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 126–28, and Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV. 2, col. 2948. Symeon's insistence that the spiritual Christian is dead to the world, *Kephalaia*, I. 10, 19; III. 35–37, 41, and 43: νεκροὶ εἰσι τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτοῖς . . . , may explain the otherwise puzzling reference to Paulician beliefs found in the *Letters* of Gregory Magistros, *T'w'erā*, ed. Kostaneanç, 161: . . . *ասեն, Ոչ գիտէք դուք զխորհուրդ մկրտութեան.*

Դեզ ոչ է փյոթմկրտել. քանզի մկրտելն մահ է [They say, you do not know the mystery of baptism; we are in no hurry to be baptized for baptism is death.]

¹⁰² Gouillard, *DTC*, XIV. 2, cols. 2952–53. Cf. Cosmas, *Traité*, xv, p. 81 f.; Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 37 (but note Puech, *Traité*, 226, note 3, on better MS); *Key of Truth*, chaps. xvi–xix, xxi, pp. 20–27 (text), 87–92 (trans.), 31–38 (text), 96–101 (trans.), with the insistence on tears (chap. xix), similar to Symeon's; and *Paulician Heresy*, 151 f., 160 f., etc.

which he describes the descent of the Holy Spirit to prepare the dwelling of the Trinity in the believer, "the Holy Ghost preceding . . . prepares the dwelling so that . . . we become the abode of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit,"¹⁰³ recall those of the ritual for Paulician baptism in the *Key of Truth*: "Spirit of the Heavenly Father . . . come down into these and fill the heart of the baptized . . . make them a temple and a dwelling place of the Father increate, of the Son our intercessor now and ever and unto eternity of eternities, Amen."¹⁰⁴ Similar beliefs, patterns of thought, and practices seem to run throughout, and it is in this mystical world with all its variations that we should probably seek the source for the accusation of "Messalianism" brought against the Neo-Paulician Bogomils.

The orthodoxy of Symeon himself has not always been beyond doubt; it was questioned by the patriarchal *synkellos* Stephen of Nicomedia and resulted in Symeon's exile.¹⁰⁵ Subsequently a number of the New Theologian's beliefs

¹⁰³ Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I.6: . . . προοδοποιούντος τοῦ Πνεύματος δηλαδή καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν προευτρεπί-
ζοντος ὡς ἐν μιᾷ συνόδῳ τῶν ὑποστάσεων μονὴν γίνεσθαι ἡμᾶς Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (cf.
John 14:23), and II.9.

¹⁰⁴ *Key of Truth*, 36: *Օրհնեալ ես հոգի հօրն երկնաւորի, . . . էջ ի սոսա եւ լից զսիրտս մկրտեցեղոս, որք այժմ մկրտեցան ի քրիստոս յիսուս, զի մի գուցէ թէ պիղծ հոգին մերձեցցի ի հաւատացեալս միածնին որդի հօրն երկնաւորի. Սրբեա զհոգիս զմիտս սոցա եւ արա տաճար եւ բնակարան հօրն անեղին, որդւոյն բարեխօսին յայժմ եւ միշտ եւ յաւիտեանս յաւիտենից, Ամէն:* (trans., *ibid.*, 100). Here again, the passage is possible of both an orthodox and a heretical (Nestorianizing) interpretation. It can also be traced through the mystical tradition back to Evagrius Ponticus, cf. Viller, "Sources" (*supra*, note 88), 255ff.

Similarly, the assumption of the passion of Christ by the spiritual Christian, Symeon, *Kephalaia*, III.81: Σκοπήσωμεν πῶς δοξάσομεν τὸν Θεόν· δοξάζεται δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ὡς παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐδοξάσθη. Δι' ὧν γὰρ ἐκείνος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πατέρα ἐδόξασεν, ἐδοξάσθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' αὐτῶν. . . . τὰδε εἰσιν ὁ σταυρός, ἡ γοῦν ἡ νέκρωσις τοῦ κόσμου παντός, αἱ θλίψεις, οἱ πειρασμοὶ καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῶν παθιμάτων Χριστοῦ· ἃ ὑποφέροντες ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, μιμούμεθα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ παθήματα καὶ δοξάζομεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸν Πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ Θεόν, ὡς υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ χάριτι καὶ συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ (cf. Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 117, note 2, for Ignatius of Antioch), finds its counterpart in the ritual for the Paulician elect in *Key of Truth*, 44: . . . հայր սուրբ . . . ծառայն քոյ յանձն առնում զգանս, զբանս, զչարհարանս, զնախատինս, զխաչս, զհարուածս, զնեղութիւնս եւ զամենայն փորձութիւնս աշխարհի, զոր տէրն եւ բարեխօսն մեր եւ ըզհանրական եւ առաքելական սուրբ եկեղեցին առին անձինս իւրեանց, եւ սիրով ընկալան զնոսա: Այսպէս եւ ես անարժան ծառայ յիսուսի քրիստոսի մեծաւ սիրով եւ յօժար կամաւ զամենեւեանս զայստիկ առնում յանձն իմ մինչեւ ի ժամ մահուան իմոյ. Ամէն: (*ibid.*, 106f.: . . . "holy father . . . I, thy servant, take on myself scourings, imprisonment, torment, reproaches, crosses, blows, tribulations, and all temptations of the world, which our Lord and intercessor and the universal and apostolic holy church took upon themselves, and lovingly accepted them. So even do I, an unworthy servant of Jesus Christ, with great love and ready will, take upon myself all these until the hour of my death, Amen"), and may explain the condemnation of the "new, horrible and loathsome bearing of suffering" [. . . նոր զազրալի եւ քստմենի ախտակրութեան] of the Paulicians by Gregory Magistros, *T'lt'era*, 153.

¹⁰⁵ Symeon, *Vita*, LXXII–c, pp. 98–139, with Hausherr commentary, pp. v, x–xi, repeated by V. Laurent, "Un nouveau monument hagiographique: la Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien," *Echos d'Orient*, 28 (1929), 433. See also, B. Krivochéine, "The Writings of St. Symeon the New Theologian," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 20 (1954) (hereafter, "Writings"), 299, editor's note; Jugie, "Oraison," 182–83; Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV.2, cols. 2943–44, 2948, 2958; *idem*, "Hérésie," 320–22. The purpose of this paper is not to inquire into the validity of Symeon's theological position, but on the contrary to show that heterodox groups were in contact with the intellectual mainstream of society and shared many of its premises which they then pushed to extremes, that both orthodox and heterodox mysticism coexisted, and to recall the perpetual thinness of the line separating orthodoxy from heresy. See *infra*, notes 109, 110.

and practices were identified as tinged with Messalianism. The charge that even in the case of his spiritual teacher, Symeon the Studite, the test of *apatheia* through contact with human bodies led to unedifying results, may lie in part behind the recurring polemical theme of Messalian and Neo-Paulician moral turpitude.¹⁰⁶ The constant prayers of the mystics awakened etymological memories of the ancient Messalians, whose Greek name, Euchitai, derived from the same practices. The very prayer urged by Symeon on his disciples, "God and Lord of all . . . destroy, kill through the presence of Thy Spirit the snake which lurks within me,"¹⁰⁷ could easily be perverted into the belief attributed to "Messalians" that Satan dwelt in every soul until driven out by prayer.¹⁰⁸ In many of the manuscripts of the New Theologian's works, passages of dubious orthodoxy and particularly the word αἰσθητῶς used by the Messalians, according to St. John of Damascus, to denote the sensible perception of the divine have been excised altogether or at least replaced by less compromising terms.¹⁰⁹

Thus, in view of the similarity of Neo-Paulician-Bogomil and mystical thought, both orthodox and heterodox, of the accusation of "Messalianism" brought against Symeon the New Theologian and his spiritual descendants, the Hesychasts,¹¹⁰ and of the fact that the Paulician innovator Sergios, who is said to have called himself not Christ but the Paraclete and to have diverted the glory of God to his own spiritual father, is identified as the ancestor of the

¹⁰⁶ Symeon, *Vita*, LXXXI, p. 110: . . . τοῦ πνευματικοῦ πατρὸς τὴν μνήμην πανηγυρικῶς ἐώρταζεν . . . ὁ . . . Συμεὼν, ἐκεῖνος δὲ προνεκρωθεὶς ἄκρας ἀπαθείας τὴν σάρκα, ἐτι περιῶν τέλεον τὰς ἐμφύτους ἀπεμαράνθη κινήσεις αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ νεκρὸς πρὸς νεκρὸν αἰσθησιν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ πλησιάζουσι σώμασιν, ὑπεκρίνετο τὴν ἐμπάθειαν, τοῦτο μὲν συσκιάζειν βουλόμενος τὸν τῆς ἀπαθείας αὐτοῦ θησαυρὸν . . . τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τινὰς εἰ οἶόν τε καὶ πάντας τοὺς κάτω κειμένους τῷ δαλεάματι τούτῳ λαμβανόντως τοῦ βυθοῦ τῆς ἀπωλείας ἀνεγκύσαι καὶ τοῦ θανάτου λυτρώσασθαι, δράσεται τῆς θαναμαστῆς ἀλείας ἐκείνου τὴν μέθοδον εἰς ἀφορμὴν εὐπροσώπου κατηγορίας ὁ σύγκελλος καὶ προβάλλεται ταύτην ἐπὶ συνόδου λέγων· ὡς ἀμαρτωλὸν ὄντα τὸν αὐτοῦ πνευματικὸν πατέρα . . . Cf. Symeon, *Kephalaia*, III. 37; Gouillard, in *DTC*, XIV. 2, col. 2973; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1285 C; and Hausherr, "Erreur," 330, 348–60. For the accusation of moral turpitude, see Psellos, *De daem. op.*, v–vi, PG, 122, cols. 832 A–833 B; Euthymius Peribleptae, *Liber*, PG, 131, col. 56 AB; Wellnhöfer, "Die thrakischen Euchiten"; and *Paulician Heresy*, 29, note 11, 95 and note 46, 107, note 95, 111, note 107d, 157, 172, 173, note 124, 179, note 140, etc.

¹⁰⁷ For the name, see Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 4. On the evil in the soul, see Symeon, *Kephalaia*, I. 60: . . . τὸν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐμφωλεύοντα δράκοντα τῇ τοῦ παναγίου σου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσει θανατώσας ἀφάνισον . . .; cf. Euthymius Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 36f., on the fouling of the soul by Satan, and Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1273 BC; also Jugie, "Oraison," 183; Puech *Traité*, 223–26; and Hausherr, "Erreur," 329f., 331, 338–48.

¹⁰⁸ John Damascene, *De haer.*, LXXX, PG, 94, cols. 732 D–733 A; Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, xxvi, PG, 130, col. 1277 BC; also Grumel, *Regestes*, p. 263f., no. 850, etc. See also the preceding note and Hausherr, "Erreur," 329, 332–36. The "Messalian" rejection of nature as evil, cf. Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia*, *ibid.*, col. 1285 B, might easily lead again to an accusation of Manichaeism.

¹⁰⁹ Krivochéine, "Writings," 306–309, 311f.; cf. Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 127, for the use of this terminology by other mystics. As Puech, *Traité*, 161 and note 6, observed, Symeon's image of being pregnant with the Holy Spirit, Μακάριος ὁ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἑαυτῷ μορφωθὲν θεασάμενος ὅτι αὐτὸς ὡς ἐμβρυον ἔχων τὸν Χριστὸν μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λογισθήσεται (cf. *Kephalaia*, III. 44), is the very one cited by Euthymius Zigabenus concerning the Bogomils, *Panoplia*, xxvii, PG, 130, col. 1317 B; . . . πάντας θεοτόκους καὶ εἶναι . . . (cf. col. 1321 C). But it is also close to the words of St. Jerome, Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 128, and ultimately goes back to St. Paul, Galat. 4:19.

¹¹⁰ See *supra*, note 105; Jugie, "Oraison," 183, and *idem*, "La controverse palamite," *Echos d'Orient*, 30 (1931), 398f., and Hausherr, "Spiritualité," 126–28, and especially 133f.; cf., however, *Synodikon*, p. 81, lines 574–84.

"Messalians" by both Euthymios of the Peribleptos and the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*,¹¹¹ may we not postulate a secondary fusion in the tenth century of some Neo-Paulicians with mystical elements perhaps affected by the contemporary Byzantine fascination with Satanism? This fusion would then lie at the back of Anna Comnena's new definition of Bogomilism as Paulicianism mixed with Messalianism.¹¹² Paulicianism would then have progressed in Byzantine circles from a form of conservative Christianity by way of extreme docetic Iconoclasm to an aberrant form of mysticism tinged with Christian dualism, but in doing so it would have come under the influence not of foreign imports but of the ideas current in the capital. The problems which reappeared distorted and perverted in heretical circles—the relationship of the human and divine natures in the Incarnation, the association of man to the deity, the relative perfection of the world still awaiting the Second Coming of Christ, the nature of true icons, of the Theotokos, of the Eucharist, of baptism, the function of prayers, the respective authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the spiritually perfect—were not tangential points; they were the crucial issues constantly debated in Byzantine religious controversies. As late as the end of the eleventh century, the condemnations of John Italos and of the Calabrian monk Nilos, whose abjuration is surprisingly Paulician, still concern themselves with those who in speaking of the Incarnation distinguish between divinity by nature and divinity by adoption (κατὰ φύσιν — κατὰ θέσιν), and who do not under-

¹¹¹ Euthymios Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 42, 56–58, and *Synodikon*, p. 65, lines 309–14: Τυχικῷ τῷ τοῦ του [Λευκοπέτρου] συμμύστη καὶ μαθητῇ τῷ καὶ ἑτέρας μὲν θείας γραφὰς διαφθείραντι καὶ παρερμηνεύσαντι, . . . καὶ πάσας τὰς περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ῥήσεις εἰς τὸν πνευματικὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα παρερμηνεύσαντι, καὶ οὕτω τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξαν πρὸς τοὺς τῆς βδελυρᾶς αὐτοῦ αἰρέσεως ἀρχηγούς μεθελκύσαντι, ἀνάθεμα. Gouillard, "Hérésie," 303 and note 27, objects to the "généalogies factices" linking Sergios and fourth-century Messalians, but the very confusion or forgery suggests a presumed link between Sergios and later "Messalianism."

Leukopetros, the presumed "spiritual father" of Sergios Tychikos, the great Paulician heresiarch, has proved a stumbling block for many scholars, e.g., Gouillard, "Hérésie," 317–19; *idem*, "Synodikon," 233f.; Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten*, 214ff., 224, 269. Yet his description in the *Synodikon*, p. 65, lines 302–308: Πέτρῳ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ τῆς τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν ἡτοι Λυκοπετριανῶν καὶ Φουνδαδιτῶν καὶ Βογομύλων αἰρέσεως, τῷ Χριστὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλέσαντι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἀναστήσεσθαι ἐπαγγεिलाμένῳ, Λυκοπέτρῳ δὲ διὰ τοῦτο μετονομασθέντι ὅτι λίθοις δικαίως διὰ τὰς ἀπείρους αὐτοῦ μαργαρίτας καὶ τὰ μυστὰ ἔργα καταχωσθεὶς ὑπέσχετο μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας τοῖς πονηροῖς αὐτοῦ συμμύσταις ἀναστήσεσθαι, . . . μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ὡς λύκος ἐν αὐτῷ δαίμων ἐφάνη τοῦ σωροῦ τῶν λίθων ἐξερχόμενος, ἀνάθεμα (= Euthymios Peribleptae, *Ep. inv.*, 24, 56f.; cf. Euthymios Zigabenus, *Confutatio*, PG, 131, col. 41 CD), fits very well with the Paulician tradition, both in Peter's claim to be a Christ (see *supra*, note 99), and in his death by lapidation which recalls the passion of the first Paulician heresiarch, Constantine-Silvanos (Petrus Siculus, xxv, PG, 104, col. 1280 C.) He may well be a local predecessor of Sergios-Tychikos who, as we have seen (*supra*, notes 28, 36, cf., however, note 70), did not belong to the Armenian branch of early Paulicianism. Consequently, we may have in him one more link in the Paulician-Messalian-mystical tradition of the quasi-worship of the leader by his disciples.

¹¹² For the fascination of eleventh-century Byzantine society with Satanism and demonology, see Psellos, *De daem. op.*, PG, 122, col. 819ff.; P. Joannou, "Les croyances démoniaques au XI^e siècle à Byzance," *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines* (Paris, 1950), I, 245–60; K. Svoboda, *La démonologie de Michel Psellos* (Brno, 1927); and L. Oeconomos, *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges* (Paris, 1918); *et al.* The growing interest in magic had required a tightening of the imperial legislation as early as the period of Leo VI, see P. Noailles and A. Dain, eds., *Les Nouvelles de Léon VI le Sage* (Paris, 1944), 237, 239, Nov. LXV; see also Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, VI.vii. The Athinganoi were also accused of magic practices and demonology, cf. Starr, "Athinganoi," 98–100, 103, unless the reference is to the Atzinganoi, see G. Soulis, "The Gypsies in the Byzantine Empire," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15 (1961), 145f., *et passim*.

stand the term Theotokos in its true and proper sense.¹¹³ The old issues were still far from being obsolete or academic, and they would be raised in the future.

This, to be sure, is no more than a suggestion, an outline. It leaves many gaps and problems to be solved and is merely intended to offer a new direction for investigations. We know of many variant groups of iconoclasts, Paulicians, Bogomils, let alone mystics. But the possibility of relating these heresies to their contemporary historical and intellectual context; the recent observations of Loos on the different character of Bulgarian and Byzantine Bogomilism and on the similarities of Paulicianism and the mystical tradition;¹¹⁴ the treatment of the Euchitai by Psellos in his *De daemonum operatione*, not as an anachronistic survival, but as an illustrative episode, in his broader treatment of fashionable eleventh-century demonology—all raise the question whether in our studies of mid-Byzantine heresies in general the time has not come to abandon archaeological expeditions and rural witch hunts, and to consider them as aberrant forms thrown up from the mainstream of contemporary intellectual and spiritual life; to concede that in the fusions of Judaeo-Hellenic Christianity and Greek philosophy characterizing Byzantine religious evolution the bastards too are children.

¹¹³ *Synodikon*, 57, 59, with Gouillard's commentary, 196–206, and especially the abjuration of Nilos of Calabria, *ibid.*, Appendix II, 301. The arguments κατὰ φύσιν — κατὰ θέσιν, specifically condemned in the *Synodikon*, were part and parcel of the Iconoclastic controversies: cf. Constantine V, frag. 19, in Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 10; John Damascene, *Orat.*, III, PG, 94, col. 1337; and Theodore Studite, *Letters*, II. ccix, PG, 99, cols. 1637, 1640. The terminology is used by Symeon the New Theologian, e.g., *Kephalaia*, III. 88, and it belongs in the mystical tradition; cf. Disdier, "S. Maxime," 302, also the interpretation of Gouillard, "Fragments," 187f. Finally, they were also consonant with the adoptionism of the Paulicians, as I will endeavor to show in a forthcoming article.

¹¹⁴ See *supra*, note 88, and Loos, "Šestodnev," especially 66f. In connection with the confused filiations, variations, and fragmentations of the various heretical or mystical groups it should be noted that the *Synodikon*, p. 65, line 292, stresses that the new heresy of the Messalians was "παμμυγής καὶ πολυώνυμος," and that Euthymius Zigabenus, *Confutatio*, PG, 131, cols. 39–40, related it pell-mell to the Phundagiagites, Bogomils, Euchites, Enthusiasts, Enkratites, and Marcionites. On subdivisions within the groups, see Ostrogorsky, *Studien*, 30, 39; Lipshits, *Očerki*, Loos, "Šestodnev," 62, 66f., and *idem*, "Mouvement I," 267; Florovsky, "Iconoclastic Controversy," 79; Gouillard, "Hérésie," 317; *Paulician Heresy*, 100 and note 72, 177f.; *et al.*